THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PRINCIPALS' REACTIONS TO CURRENT PROPOSALS FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

by

© WILLIAM LYSAK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1973

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Principals' Reactions to Current Proposals for Educational Change" submitted by William Lysak in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

E. Miklos
Supervisor

James A. Small

Henry Hryshchyshyn

Date July 19, 1973

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the opinions of school principals in the Province of Alberta with respect to the implementation of some proposals on school organization and operation as outlined by Worth in his Report, A Choice of Futures. Specifically, an attempt was made to examine (1) the extent to which principals in the province agreed with the proposals for change, (2) the degree to which they perceived the proposals to be significant for change, and (3) the extent to which they perceived the implementation of the proposals to be feasible.

An attempt was also made to investigate if there were differences of opinions in regard to agreement, significance, and ease of implementation of the proposals, amongst subgroups of principals that were derived on the basis of various school, and personal and professional characteristics.

Data were collected by means of a questionnaire that was designed by the researcher. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of fifty proposals that were either explicitly stated or implied in the Worth Report, while the second part dealt with school characteristics, and the respondents' personal and professional characteristics.

For the purposes of analysing the data, means were tabulated for each of the proposals within each task area, pertaining to the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation.

On the basis of the means, the proposals were ranked for the total group of principals and for each of the subgroups of principals. An overall ranking of the fifty proposals was also made.

In order to determine the relationship amongst the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was applied. This statistical measure was also used to determine the degree of concordance amongst various subgroups of principals.

The results indicated that three proposals ranked amongst the highest on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation in the task areas of curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, and physical facilities, in addition to being included amongst the top eleven proposals in the overall ranking of the fifty proposals. These proposals stated that (1) greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies, (2) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy, and (3) buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community.

The findings of this study also indicated that the highest degree of concordance amongst the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation for the total group of principals was evident in the task areas of school-community relations and staff personnel. The lowest degree of concordance, on the other hand, was observed in the task areas dealing with use of community and school resources, and system planning and management.

When the responses of various subgroups of principals were analysed, differences of opinion were most evident amongst subgroups formed on the basis of grade organization, years of teacher education, and years of experience as a principal. The task areas where the lowest degree of concordance was evident, generally in the category of ease of implementation, were those relating to use of community and school resources, system planning and management, and physical facilities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to his advisor, Dr. E. Miklos, for his invaluable assistance during the design of the study and the writing of the thesis. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. J. Small and Dr. H. W. Hodysh who served as the other members of the committee.

Acknowledgement is extended to the ATA for providing financial assistance for this study.

The writer wishes to thank the school principals in Alberta who participated in this study for their cooperation.

Finally, sincere thanks are extended to the writer's sister-in-law, Betty Lysak, for typing this thesis, and to his wife, Evelyn, and other members of his family for their support and encouragement throughout the duration of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES xii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 2

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 3

ASSUMPTIONS 5

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 5

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 6

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS 6

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE 8

LITERATURE PERTINENT TO TASK AREAS 8

School-Community Relations 9
Curriculum and Instruction 12
Use of Community and School Resources 17
Staff Personnel 21
System Planning and Management 25
Physical Facilities 29

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING CHANGE 30

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL'S PERCEPTIONS IN CHANGE IMPLEMENTATION 33

SUMMARY 35

3. RESEARCH DESIGN 37

INSTRUMENTATION 37

Design of Questionnaire 37
Pretest of Questionnaire 44

Chapter Page

THE SAMPLE 45

COLLECTION OF DATA 46

ANALYSIS OF DATA 48

SUMMARY 53

4. ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR THE TOTAL GROUP OF PRINCIPALS 54

FINDINGS FOR EACH TASK AREA 54

School-Community Relations 55
Agreement 55
Significance 55
Ease of implementation 58
Curriculum and Instruction 59
Agreement 59
Significance 59
Ease of implementation 62
Use of Community and School Resources 62
Agreement 62
Significance 63
Ease of implementation 63
Staff Personnel 65
Agreement 65
Significance 65
Ease of implementation 68
System Planning and Management 69
Agreement 69
Significance 72
Ease of implementation 72
Physical Facilities 73
Agreement 73
Significance 73
Ease of implementation 75

OVERALL FINDINGS FOR THE FIFTY PROPOSALS 75

Highest Ranked Proposals on Agreement 76
Lowest Ranked Proposals on Agreement 80
Highest Ranked Proposals on Significance 82
Lowest Ranked Proposals on Significance 85
Highest Ranked Proposals on Ease of Implementation . . 87
Lowest Ranked Proposals on Ease of Implementation . . 91

RELATIONSHIP AMONG AGREEMENT, SIGNIFICANCE, AND EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION 93

Chapter Page

SUMMARY 95

5. ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR THE VARIOUS SUBGROUPS OF PRINCIPALS 98

SUBGROUPS BASED ON SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 99

Grade Organization 99
Agreement 100
Significance 100
Ease of implementation 105
Size of School 109
Agreement 109
Significance 109
Ease of implementation 111
School Types 111
Agreement 111
Significance 113
Ease of implementation 113
Urban and Rural Localities 113
Agreement 113
Significance 115
Ease of implementation 115

SUBGROUPS BASED ON PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRINCIPALS 116

Age 116
Agreement 116
Significance 118
Ease of implementation 118
Years of Teacher Education 118
Agreement 119
Significance 119
Ease of implementation 119
Amount of Graduate Training 121
Agreement 121
Significance 124
Ease of implementation 124
Years of Experience As a Principal 124
Agreement 125
Significance 125
Ease of implementation 125

CONCLUSIONS PERTAINING TO AGREEMENT, SIGNIFICANCE, AND EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION 131

SUMMARY 132

Chapter Page

6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS 134

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH PROBLEM AND DESIGN 134

The Problem 134
The Instrument 135
The Sample 136
Collection of Data 136
Analysis of Data 136

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS 137

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THE FINDINGS 142

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE 143

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 151

BIBLIOGRAPHY 152

APPENDICES 162

A. Questionnaire 163

B. Covering and Follow-Up Letters 176

C. Percentage Distribution Tables 179

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Proposals Drawn from the Worth Report and the Pages on which They Appear	39
2.	Number and Percentage of Principals in Each Grade Organization, and Number of Principals in Representative Sample	47
3.	Number of Principals Contacted, Number of Returned Questionnaires, and Number Used for the Study	49
4.	Characteristics of Principals in the Sample	51
5.	Means and Ranks of Proposals in the School-Community Relations Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals	56
6.	Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Curriculum and Instruction Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals	60
7.	Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Task Area Pertaining to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals	64
8.	Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Staff Personnel Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals	66
9.	Means and Ranks of Proposals in the System Planning and Management Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals	70
10.	Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Physical Facilities Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals	74
11.	Means and Ranks of All Proposals, in the Category of Agreement, Based on Responses from the Total Sample of Principals	77

Table

Page

12. Means and Ranks of All Proposals, in the Category of Significance, Based on Responses from the Total Sample of Principals 83

13. Means and Ranks of All Proposals, in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Based on Responses from the Total Sample of Principals 88

14. Relationship amongst Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation for the Total Sample of Principals, for Each Task Area 94

15. Extent of Concordance amongst Principals from Various Grade Organizations on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 101

16. Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Agreement, Pertaining to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations 102

17. Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Significance, Relating to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations 104

18. Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Significance, Referring to Physical Facilities, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations 106

19. Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Pertaining to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations 108

20. Extent of Concordance amongst Principals of Various School Sizes on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 110

21. Extent of Concordance between Principals of Different School Types on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 112

22. Extent of Concordance amongst Principals from Urban and Rural Areas on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 114

Table Page

23. Extent of Concordance amongst Principals of Various Age Categories on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 117

24. Extent of Concordance amongst Principals of Various Number of Years of Teacher Education on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 120

25. Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Relating to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals with Various Number of Years of Teacher Education . . . 122

26. Extent of Concordance amongst Principals, Experiencing Various Amounts of Graduate Training, on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 123

27. Extent of Concordance amongst Administrators of Various Number of Years as Principal on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area 126

28. Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Dealing with Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Administrators with Various Number of Years of Experience as Principal 127

29. Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, in the System Planning and Management Task Area, Based on Responses of Administrators with Various Number of Years of Experience as Principal 129

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

In recent years a considerable amount of discussion has focussed on various aspects of the educational process. The aims and purposes of education have been challenged, and the educational programmes in schools have been judged by some writers to be less than satisfactory. Criticism has been directed at existing programmes of study for their shortcomings in providing meaningful learning experiences for students; questions have also been raised about the effectiveness of teaching and administrative practices in meeting the needs of students. Consequently today's schools are faced with the problem of student alienation. This criticism was well illustrated by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971:205) when they asserted that:

> One of the major problems facing primary and secondary school students is the climate of supervision which communicates a lack of trust and relies heavily on marks and promotion procedures to gain control and compliance. Another major factor, however, in a student's indoctrination into alienation is the curricular program itself. Because of both an overconcentration on memory as well as a hyperrational approach to knowledge and experience, students often perceive their academic learning experiences as belonging to a separate universe that has nothing to do with their real world.

The Worth Report on Education, A Choice of Futures, was published in Alberta in 1972. This Report upheld the aforementioned criticisms during its consideration of many issues in education and

made a number of proposals for change in the educational system. It conveyed the idea to professional educators and the general public to become involved in planning for this educational change, so that in the future the educational process would be different from what it has been in the past. In response to a question about the main objectives of the Report, it was reported by McIntosh and Bryce (1972:32) that Worth said:

> We hope, however, that one of the things our report will do is to act as a catalyst which accelerates the rate and pace of change in our institutions for schooling. I am optimistic enough to believe that there is a sensitivity abroad in our province to the need for change that will probably help to bring about this acceleration.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem under investigation in this study was to examine the opinions of Alberta school principals with respect to the implementation of some proposals on school organization and operation as outlined by Worth in his Report, A Choice of Futures. More specifically, an attempt was made to examine (1) the extent to which principals in the province agreed with the proposals for change, (2) the extent of agreement regarding the significance of the proposals for educational change, and (3) the feasibility of implementing the proposals for change.

The following subproblems were also investigated in this study.

Are there differences of opinions in regard to the proposals for change amongst principals:

1. of schools with various grade organizations?

2. who administer schools of various sizes?

3. of various school types?

4. who administer schools in urban and rural localities?

5. of various age categories?

6. with various number of years of teacher education?

7. with varying number of years of graduate training?

8. with differing number of years of experience as principal?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In his Report, Worth discussed a number of changes which have been proposed or implemented elsewhere, and which would have far-reaching effects on the educational system in Alberta if they were adopted. As was contended by Bumbarger et al (1972:1), if some of these ideas are even partially implemented they will create the necessity for further adjustments that will in time change the structure of formal education in this province. Thus, the ideas discussed and the proposals that are either explicitly stated or implied in the Report need to be studied carefully by principals since they will be called upon to be instrumental in implementing them. Principals will play a crucial role in making various key decisions regarding what is to be done and how it is to be done during the implementation process.

Further, as was asserted by Neagley and Evans (1970:141) and Heller (1968:19), regardless of who introduces the change, it cannot be successfully implemented unless it has the principal's approval.

This clearly implies the contention made by Owens (1970:146), that in the school situation it is the principal who must play the crucial role of a change agent if change is to be brought about.

Ingram (1966:44) claimed that one major factor influencing the principal in the adoption process is the attitudes of his peer or work group toward change in general. Maddocks (1970:173), after conducting a study on the extent to which the recommendations of the 1958 Alberta Royal Commission on Education were implemented, concluded that recommendations bearing on certain internal matters of major professional groups have less chance of being implemented if those groups perceive the implementation as not being feasible. In a similar study to that done by Maddocks, Daloise (1970:27) found that recommendations made by the Cameron Commission were likely to be implemented where the initial reaction to them was favourable, whereas those that received unfavourable reaction initially were more likely to be held for further consideration. These findings would seem to suggest that if principals' perceptions of certain proposals in the Worth Report were initially unfavourable, the chances of those particular proposals being implemented would be, at least to some extent, decreased.

This study provided some evidence about the degree to which principals supported various proposals in the Report. It also provided some evidence about the extent to which the proposals were perceived by principals to be significant for change and the extent to which they perceived implementation to be feasible. Such data may, therefore, prove useful to principals in aiding them to plan

their strategy for implementing some of the proposals.

ASSUMPTIONS

For the purposes of this study the following assumptions were made:

1. The sample chosen for this study was representative of the population of school principals administering grades one through twelve in Alberta.

2. The proposals chosen for this study were applicable to grades one through twelve in the province.

3. The proposals were worded in such a manner that their meaning was understood by the principals.

4. Principals had the necessary knowledge and understanding of the areas that the questionnaire dealt with.

5. The questions were carefully considered prior to being answered by the principals.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The following limitations were inherent in this study:

1. The Worth Report included numerous proposals for change in education throughout the grade one to twelve levels. Because of this large number of proposals, it was possible to include only some of them in the study.

2. Since some proposals were not explicitly stated in the Report, they have been subject to the researcher's interpretation when he designed the questionnaire.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was delimited in the following manner:

1. The study was restricted to the collection and analysis of data from principals administering grades one through twelve in the Province of Alberta.

2. Principals who administer schools of special education in the province, were excluded from the study because they could not be categorized on the basis of grade organization and because their number was too small to form a separate category.

3. No opinions of other professional groups such as teachers and superintendents were sought.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

In this chapter the problem was stated, the underlying assumptions made during the study were presented, and the limitations and delimitations of the study were discussed. In Chapter 2, the discussion focusses on a review of the related literature that is pertinent to the proposals for change put forth in A Choice of Futures. In addition, this chapter outlines briefly the role of the principal in implementing proposals such as those suggested in the Report, and discusses the part his perceptions play in influencing his decisions to implement the proposed changes. Chapter 3 describes the research design of this study. The discussion in this chapter focusses on the design and pretesting of the questionnaire, the selection of the sample, and the collection and analysis of data.

Chapter 4 discusses the research findings pertinent to the total group of principals in the sample, while Chapter 5 presents an analysis of the findings for subgroups. The subgroups of principals were divided into those based on certain school characteristics and those based on various personal characteristics. Chapter 6 presents a summary of the study, puts forth some conclusions and implications arising from the study, and makes some suggestions in regard to further research.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review some of the recent ideas presented in the literature as they pertain to various proposals that are either explicitly stated or implied in the Worth Report. However, an in-depth review of the literature pertinent to all the proposals included in the study would be a formidable task. Hence, the decision has been made to delimit the review to writings that pertain to selected proposals within the various task areas.

Also discussed in this chapter is the role of the principal in implementing the proposed ideas for change. Of particular significance is the manner in which his perceptions of the educational situation influence his decisions for implementing these concepts.

LITERATURE PERTINENT TO TASK AREAS

During the past several years, there has appeared a vast amount of literature discussing means by which the various aspects of education may be improved. Included amongst the ideas discussed are ways of (1) fostering school-community relations, (2) revising curricular designs and instructional methods, (3) making better use of community and school resources, (4) utilizing staff personnel more effectively, (5) improving planning procedures and management

techniques, and (6) changing the design of physical facilities.

School-Community Relations

A great deal of discussion has recently centred on ways of improving the relationship between the school and the community. Some writers have claimed that the existing gulf between the schools and the communities is detrimental to the learning process. This gulf, according to the authors, can be reduced by means of greater involvement in the affairs of the school of parents and other laymen from the school's attendance area.

Worth (1972:126-127) contended that greater parental involvement in school affairs be encouraged and advocated the implementation of a school council for the purposes of fostering this involvement. This council would consist of parents and other laymen, students, teachers, and administrators. It may assume such responsibilities as (1) determining the school's budget priorities; (2) developing regulations pertaining to such matters as discipline, attendance, and dress; and (3) formulating policies for the programme of studies. In addition, it may be given authority to audit the school for the purposes of determining the extent to which objectives are being accomplished, and it may be expected to communicate the needs of the school and its surrounding community to the school board. The principal of the school, however, would be given the responsibility for implementing the policies established by the school council.

Other authors of recent literature have also focussed on the

importance of establishing a sound relationship between the school and the community. Campbell et al (1971:137), for example, clearly illustrated the significance of such a relationship when they said:

> Because education . . . is largely a public venture, and because in the final analysis it can be no better than the citizens of a community will have it, school-community relationships represent both a point of beginning and a continuing concern for any administrator.

In order to foster the development of desirable school-community relations, some authors have suggested, as did Worth, that greater involvement of parents and other laymen in the school's operation be sought. One such author was Betty (1969:50) who claimed that direct parental involvement is more productive in terms of continued interest. Selden (1969:86), although being in agreement with Betty, pursued the argument further by suggesting that parental alienation from the school can be reduced by bringing parents and other members of the local community into the school's operation in a meaningful way. While discussing citizen involvement in decision-making, Menkin (1969:258-260) provided assurance that citizens are not concerned with running the schools. All they want, he said, is to be respected for their ideas. Thus, for the purposes of exploring decision-making, setting goals, and collaboration between lay and professional personnel, he proposed the setting up of citizens' councils. Blumenberg (1971:60) supported Menkin's contention, by maintaining that the creation of a school-community advisory council can produce miraculous results in terms of programme acceptance and improved community relations.

Miklos (1970a:28) pointed out that it may be necessary to

increase the involvement of students, teachers, and parents in decision-making at the local school level. He said:

> . . . there may be a need to place a greater emphasis on the school as the unit in which more significant decisions are made. This suggestion is made in the context of the need for decentralization of tactical decisions and for increased involvement. It may be that the greatest part of the desire for increased involvement by teachers, as well as by students and parents, can be met at the level of the school.

Burbridge (1972:7), however, took a somewhat different view than the aforementioned authors, by advocating total community control of schools. He proposed that the community be in complete control of the teaching methods, the curriculum, school rules and regulations, supplies, and the hiring and firing of staff. Deshler and Erlick (1972:174) were in agreement with Burbridge, by suggesting that there must be public accountability and control of education. According to these authors, it is the responsibility of the professionals to implement the objectives and policies that are determined by the public. Also, the public has the right to evaluate the performance of the professionals. Fantini (1972:679) reiterated the contention of these authors when he said:

> Laymen determine the goals of education and the policies calculated to achieve them. Laymen delegate to professionals the responsibilities for implementing these policies. Professionals participate in the development of goals and priorities, but the public's right to evaluate and to hold publicly employed professionals accountable is fundamental.

Perrone (1971:36), who also advocated that parents assist teachers in establishing goals and that they evaluate educational outcomes, urged parents to sit through classes in order to gain a better understanding of what is happening to their children.

Britton and Britton (1970:311) suggested that the school should be a "problem-solving area" for the community, whereby it remains open to the community throughout the day and evening and around the calendar. Miller (1970:26) was in agreement with the contention made by these authors when he put forth the idea that the school should be a "community centre" where the needs and wants of all people are fulfilled. Russell (1971:594) supported this position by suggesting that schools should become "learning centres" for all members of the community. He also maintained that by engaging parents, teachers, and students in a cooperative learning environment the building of cohesiveness between the family and society will be enhanced and there will be an awareness developed that learning is a lifelong process rather than solely a school experience.

Curriculum and Instruction

A number of educators have stressed the importance of making education more relevant to the needs of students. They have called for changes in the curriculum and instructional techniques so that education would be more in line with changes that are taking place in society. This relevance, according to the educators, can be brought about through greater parental and student involvement in the educational process.

Worth (1972:153) suggested that since education must become lifelong and future oriented, there is a need for significant changes in the programmes of study at the schools so that schooling would be in harmony with the social change that has already begun. Because,

at present, the process of schooling is somewhat divorced from the process of living, he claimed that today's students are justified in their criticism of the relevance of what they learn at school and how they learn it.

In the context of this concern for the relevance of education, Worth (1972:153-157) elaborated upon three different modes of programme operation and instruction. These included (1) the institutional mode, (2) the membership mode, and (3) the autonomous mode. Within the institutional mode of operation the programme is prescribed by the professional rather than by the learner, while in the membership mode a group of learners determine their learning activities and the teacher's authority is granted by the learners. Further, in the autonomous mode, the learners determine their own programme of studies and are the authorities on the methods, content, objectives, and effectiveness of their learning. During his discussion of some implications arising from the elaboration upon the three modes of instruction, Worth (1972:157) said:

> While differing markedly from Mode I proposals, those in Modes II and III have a number of features in common. Learners would operate without dependence on external authority. No institutional representative would be in control of rewards and assessments; the criteria for learning would be chosen by the learners themselves.

Throughout his discussion in the Report, however, it seems evident that Worth gave preference to the latter two modes of instruction since many of his proposals clearly implied a greater personalization of instruction.

A number of other educators also stressed the need for making

education more relevant to the needs of students. Horowitz (1970:16), for instance, while commenting on matters pertaining to curriculum, contended that:

> We desperately need a relevant curriculum which is responsive to the needs of the student and designed to meet those needs as he perceives them. We can only develop it if the school maintains close ties with its community, enlisting the aid and advice of parents, involving community groups and parents in a consideration of curriculum needs and keeping the community fully informed of changes and their results.

Alexander (1972:656-657) agreed with the point of view outlined by Horowitz; he maintained that the starting point in curriculum development is the involvement of parents having real and personal concerns regarding a particular school. Such participation, he claimed, would enable the school to provide more relevant curriculum opportunities to students. Keeping the importance of parental involvement in mind, Jackson (1972:694) proposed the construction of a "curriculum council." This council, he argued, will offer great promise for constituent participation in curriculum matters. Richards (1968:47) did not dispute the position that "local units" should develop and adapt the curriculum to the needs of the community; however, he pointed out that it is not possible to bring about changes in the curriculum without first changing teachers.

In reference to teachers, Schmuck and Blumberg (1969:90) stressed the desirability of involving them in the decision-making process, particularly when issues arise that pertain to the curriculum. Such participation, according to these authors, will enhance problem solving within the school. Telfer (1969:542), while

agreeing with the position of teacher participation in decisions regarding curriculum improvement, added that teachers like to become involved in decision-making, goal setting, and planning type activities.

Til (1969:16) stated that teaching must be suited to the student's background, drives, and life in order for learning to take place. Goldman (1970:493) fully agreed with Til, but added that values should be taught to enable students to choose alternatives more wisely when placed in a position to do so. Metcalf and Hunt (1970:360) pursued this argument to a greater extent by claiming that:

> . . . we need the kind of educational relevance that would help and require young people to examine their most basic assumptions about the kind of world that exists and how they propose to change the world from what it is into something preferable . . . .

The kind of relevance proposed by Metcalf and Hunt can, according to Worth (1972:191), be an integral part of Canadian studies which are suited to problem solving and the inquiry approach.

Worth (1972:204) also put forth the proposition that mastery learning should be stressed, since it offers successful and rewarding experiences for students. Of a similar opinion to that of Worth were other educators (Airasian, 1968; Block, 1971; Bloom, 1971) who maintained that this approach develops a lifelong interest for learning, promotes the fullest development of each learner, and ensures high levels of achievement for students. Further similarity to Worth's contention was evident in the writings of Ellsberg (1969:175), who advocated a "performance curriculum" whereby schools

strive to teach toward students attaining goals rather than gathering credits for graduation, and by Okey (1971:384), who claimed that mastery should be defined in terms of performance.

Chesler (1970:10) and Torkelson (1972:318) suggested that individualized instruction calls for a professional and philosophical commitment to the notion of allowing students to have a say in matters pertaining to the educational programmes. Berg (1970:110) maintained a similar position by claiming that students of all ability levels can benefit if opportunities are provided for them to explore and develop their ideas. According to Berg, the student:

> . . . must determine, with the assistance of his teacher-counselor, his own activities, and set his own goals. Likewise, he must accept personal accountability for achieving those educational goals.

Ohme (1970:302) recommended that an "interest-centred curriculum" be implemented in the schools, whereby the students can make their choices from a wide range of alternative offerings. This idea was clearly supported by Fantini (1973:448), when he elaborated upon the proposal that schools provide educational alternatives so that students will be able to match themselves with different learning environments. In this approach, provisions would be made for students to match their preferences with a particular style of teaching. The outcome of such a match, according to Fantini, would be an increase in student productivity.

Young (1969:38) contended that students and teachers should work, plan, and evaluate together, in order to meet the objectives of a particular learning situation. This type of cooperative situation

can, according to Hillson (1968:66), be attained through a "continuous progress" educational programme.

In addition to supporting the ideas that values should be taught at schools and mastery learning should be stressed, Worth also upheld several other ideas proposed by various authors when he implied that (1) teaching methods should be individual-centred, (2) teachers and learners should mutually develop performance objectives, (3) students should be evaluated on the basis of performance objectives, and (4) course content should focus on the interests and concerns of students. These proposals appeared in various contexts throughout the Report.

Use of Community and School Resources

There have been a number of propositions put forth recently for greater utilization of community and school resources. Of particular interest is the claim made by several writers that the use of human and technological resources in the school and the community, will foster the individualization of learning and will provide students with the opportunities to engage in a programme of career education.

Worth (1972:241) proposed that there be an extensive utilization of volunteer aides at the grades one through twelve levels of education. While stating the advantages of utilizing these aides, he said:

> They could relieve professional teachers of non-instructional duties, thus enabling teachers to devote more time and energy to planning, preparation and efficient performance of those duties at the heart of

> the teaching-learning process. Volunteers could also provide needed services to individual learners to supplement the work of teachers, and thereby make possible the personalized learning envisioned in . . . this report.

In addition, Worth (1972:242) contended that differentiated staffing should include community resource people. Unlike the volunteer aides, however, the community resource people would be paid for their services and would be required to possess a greater degree of specialization in their talents.

Some other authors have stated similar opinions to those of Worth when they also proposed that volunteer aides be more extensively utilized by the schools. Hickman (1972:124), for example, maintained that because volunteers can provide support for the instructional programme of a school, it is the educator's responsibility to show alertness in identifying these talents and then to display enough flexibility to use them once they have been recognized. Kapfer and Kapfer (1972:10) asserted that teachers need paraprofessional aides to work with them during the implementation of programmes. Bazeli (1969:207) held a similar opinion but maintained that aides should be recruited from applicants living in the vicinity of the school. Wolansky (1972:30) was in agreement with the assertion that teacher aides should be employed, by pointing out that the student would then receive more individualized instruction and the teacher's role would be made more manageable in terms of working conditions. Nickerson (1972:107-110), however, was not as optimistic as Wolansky in regard to the benefits of involving teacher aides in the learning process. Upon reviewing three studies, dealing with the

employment of teacher aides, he concluded that one cannot necessarily predict increased student achievement but can expect some changes in teacher communication patterns.

Worth (1972:177) proposed that the world of work and other areas of life be used by students as a life experience learning laboratory. While elaborating on this proposition, he said:

> Thus, when it is suggested that the world of work and relaxation be used as a learning laboratory for recurrent education, traditional concepts about both work and education have been turned upside down. Traditionally, education is seen as a laboratory in which people learn how to work, while this report sees work as a laboratory for education.

Some other authors were of a similar opinion to that of Worth when they proposed that schools make greater use of the resources within the community and that the entire community should become a learning laboratory for students. Two such authors were Rosenstein (1972:129) and Sebolt (1972:410), who maintained that by living and experiencing the environment through people who live and work in it students will develop attitudes and dispositions that will enable them to survive in an urban society. Weldy (1970:79) agreed with the position of utilizing community resources, when he said:

> Take the students and the school to the community and bring the community resources into the school. Get people from the community who are involved in the action on social problems--civil rights, housing, pollution, politics, law and order, press and visual media. Organizations outside the school stand ready to engage in such a curriculum.

Worth (1972:179-180) also clearly implied that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided for students. During his discussion of this idea he

stated:

> Schools must begin career discussions and orientation as part of the anticipation function. Beginning at the intermediate level, exploration into broad occupational areas should be available to all students.

He added that the main purpose of this career-oriented approach would be to make young people aware of the options available to them, as well as bridging the gap between theory and practice. For children who are too young to benefit from work experience, Worth proposed that much more field experience be provided than is the case at present.

A number of other writers (Dull, 1972; Worthington, 1972; Moore and Gysbers, 1972; Law, 1972) have also proposed that career education should become an integral part of the school programme. They contended that this type of education is the best possible approach for enriching the students' learning and preparing them for rewarding lives. Hansen (1972:249) and Marland (1972:204), although agreeing with the proposal that career education be implemented in schools, stressed that the success of such a programme requires an extensive collaboration with business and industry. This collaboration, according to Strohmenger and Henderson (1972:262), could be brought about by the administrator assuming his proper leadership role in drawing the best vocational resource personnel.

Other proponents of career education include Hagans and Svicarovich (1972:224), who claimed that learning should mesh smoothly with work and community life; Pautler (1971:174), who suggested that occupational education should begin during the

elementary school years; and Lavender (1972:217), who emphasized that career education will enable the student to identify his goals and evaluate his abilities in reaching these goals.

Worth (1972:260) contended that the use of the computer could help individualize learning. He stated:

> It follows that if computers are programmed humanely, and employed in responsive, non-threatening learning environments, they could help make schooling more humanizing than it presently is.

In a publication prior to the Worth Report, Anderson (1968:67) also envisioned several benefits arising from the use of the computer. Included amongst his list of reasons for the use of the computer were (1) the facilitation of better policy decisions, (2) the opportunities provided by the computer for experimentation with school situations without disturbing the present practice, and (3) the possibilities that this technological advance provides for accommodating individual differences. Bush and DeLay (1968:179), after expounding upon a similar list of uses as that provided by Anderson, concluded that:

> Clearly the time has come for local teachers and administrators to make the decisions that they were excused from making when innovation could not be scheduled within the limits of manual schedule building. Where there is no money for more teachers or more facilities, educators can now experiment with deploying existing resources in new instructional configurations to achieve the same objectives that once only 'more resources' promised to achieve.

Staff Personnel

In order that the concepts outlined in the aforementioned task areas be implemented, there must be effective utilization of

staff personnel. One plan that has been put forth by some authors for making better use of personnel is differentiated staffing.

Worth (1972:237) proposed that the concept of differentiated staffing be employed throughout all levels of education. In his explanation of the concept he said:

> Differentiated staffing means translating the division-of-labor and specialization-by-function concepts, which have worked so well in business and industry, into terms appropriate for schooling. An essential term or condition is that staff skills match learner needs. This may sound prosaic, but it is not. It is a revolutionary condition since few, if any, of our institutions for schooling are staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs.

While further discussing the topic of utilizing personnel at schools, Worth (1972:238-245) clearly implied that (1) special professional personnel, such as speech therapists and psychologists, should not be required to have teaching certificates; (2) when no suitably qualified professional, trainee, or volunteer is available, school authorities should have the freedom to employ whomever they wish for special tasks; and (3) since unique competencies are required for administrative work, it makes little sense to place distinguished teachers in administrative positions. In addition, he contended that counselling services be made available to teachers-in-training for the purposes of facilitating self-selection by prospective teachers.

Other authors of recent literature also pointed out the merits of differentiated staffing. One such author was Cooper (1972:5) who claimed that differentiated staffing recognizes individual differences in teachers and students, and thereby attempts

to better utilize the energies and talents of the teachers by creating different kinds of teacher roles. Allen and Morrison (1972:51), although being in agreement with Cooper that differentiated staffing utilizes staff talents more effectively, added that it makes the teacher's role more manageable and releases the fullest potential of the teacher.

English (1972:198) was in general agreement with the previous authors, but took a somewhat different view. He noted that the identification of senior teaching skills in classrooms, by means of differentiated staffing is not only the touchstone of educational improvement but also is the heart of full teacher professionalization. He contended, therefore, that in some way the differentiation of staff must come about.

Richard (1971:74) discussed the desirability of implementing differentiated staffing for the purposes of retaining outstanding teachers in the classroom. He asserted that:

> With superior and excellent teachers being financially rewarded for their added ability and responsibility, we could keep them in the classroom and working with children. They would not have to move up to administrative posts for remuneration, which deprives the profession and the students of their teaching skills and rapport.

Worth (1972:47) pointed out that an emerging alternative remuneration method, which he suggested not be discounted, is that of paying teachers on the basis of end results. Lessinger (1970:340) was of a similar conviction to that of Worth when he maintained that schools should be responsible for the results of their activity. While discussing accountability in education, he said:

> By focusing upon results, on student achievement, it can be a most powerful catalyst in achieving that basic reform and renewal so sorely needed in the school system.

Lessinger (1970:345) also was of the opinion that if teachers are committed to accountability, better instructional practices will emerge. The expected changes that will result, according to him, include (1) a shift in the teaching role from information-giving to directing learning, (2) a greater flexibility in the use of the school's facilities, and (3) a more relevant curriculum. Further, Lessinger (1971:14) claimed that it permits the system of instruction to be judged by the results that are produced. This claim is congruent with that made by Wick and Beggs (1971:203), when they stated that the measurement of student changes should be the criterion for evaluating teacher effectiveness. Johnson (1971:37), although being in agreement with Wick and Beggs that student variables should be one of the bases for teacher evaluation, pointed out that criterion referenced student testing must first be developed if useful information is to be available for evaluative purposes.

A number of other authors held differing views, however, on the accountability movement. Deterline (1971:20) noted that various instructional projects have indicated that accountability can be implemented in an efficient manner, and thus could be made a "way of life" in schools. Duncan (1971:30) and Hastings (1971:14), although stating that accountability may be a good thing for education, warned educators to beware of the possibility that schools could become the lone public institutions operating on such a basis.

Kruger (1972:17) concluded that accountability is worth the required expenditures of effort, but must not be considered a panacea for most educational problems. Cunningham (1972:90) indicated that there is some confusion regarding the meaning of accountability. He said:

> . . . we must search for ways to understand what it means to be accountable, what accountability expectations are among the many constituencies of the institution as well as among professionals within the institution.

Some writers (Harmes, 1971; Mayrhofer, 1971; Mecklenburger, 1972) advocated that performance contracting, a process whereby an outside agency gets paid on the basis of student results, holds great promise for education. Johnson (1971:59) pursued this contention further by suggesting that there be a greater involvement of the school's existing staff in performance contracting. However, he proposed that this type of contracting be limited to teachers working with low achievers. Since such contracts would provide pay bonuses for teachers, he maintained that experienced teachers would be attracted to work with those students who are not achieving. Blaschke (1971:141), although acknowledging the possible merits of performance contracting, pointed out that:

> Performance contracting . . . in education are not panaceas, but merely management tools to assist school systems to become effective and efficient. The concept of performance contracting can also be abused if applied without discretion, thus increasing the probability that the concept could be distorted before it has the opportunity to prove itself.

System Planning and Management

In recent years the contention has been made that there is a need for improvement in educational planning procedures and

management techniques. Some educators have maintained that educational planning must be made more efficient whereby better use of the existing resources is made in the designing of school programmes.

Worth (1972:221) asserted that efficiency as an objective of educational planning has recently assumed dominance because of a general public suspicion that the increases of output of schools are less visible than the increases of input. Hence, the emphasis has shifted from increasing the resource allocations to making better use of available resources. In his elaboration of the principle of efficiency in educational planning Worth said:

> Planning to achieve efficient operation requires scrupulous monitoring of each stage of the decision process from setting goals to evaluating results. Clarifying goals should also lead to setting priorities among goals. Action on some may have to be deferred until additional resources are available. Special attention must be given to costing in the design and evaluation of programs.

Other educators have also contended that it may be possible to achieve the same results with less costly resources. Miklos (1970b:35), for example, asserted that there is no reason for educational organizations not to become increasingly efficient whereby the same or improved results are achieved with less costly resources. This increase in output, according to the author, may be produced by means of improved technology or by more effectively utilizing resources rather than by increasing all resources. Manning (1969:181-183) was also of the opinion that a more rational allocation of resources be made, and proposed that curriculum developers use a cost analysis approach for determining the cost of

a particular programme in relation to goal attainment. He claimed that the use of this technique would enable educators to make a more intelligent choice among alternatives, on the basis of greatest effectiveness and least cost. Carpenter and Haggart (1970:26), although agreeing with Manning that cost analysis can assist the planner in relating the effectiveness of the programme to the resources required for its implementation, cautioned educators that it can be a misused analytical technique.

Other educators have proposed a planning, programming, budgeting system (PPBS) for arriving at a more meaningful use of resources. Smith (1972:663), for example, maintained that PPBS can help educators to make better use of their resources, thereby facilitating learning. Jones (1971:409) provided support for using PPBS by reporting a case where this system has proven to be a viable technique for improving instruction. He was of the opinion that PPBS has helped the school implement needed changes when being faced with tight fiscal constraints. Levine et al (1972:24) pursued the merits of the PPBS model further than the previous authors, and concluded that:

> PPB provides a framework and basis for system change, stressing the central role of analysis in planning. Still it is difficult and often dangerous to alter the basic function and structure of large organizations. Changes which are either incompletely or improperly instituted or which lack adequate support can even result in a decrease in productivity of effectiveness of system function.

Hartley (1972:660-661) pointed out that the limited evidence, consisting mostly of testimonials by local practitioners, suggests

that PPBS is worth the effort. However, he noted that this innovation depends ultimately on the abilities of the user. Worth (1972:229) upheld the arguments put forth by the proponents of PPBS by claiming that although there are many shortcomings in the planning-programming-budgeting strategy, there are also convincing arguments in favour of relating expenditures in a more direct manner to the objectives that programmes are purporting to achieve.

Worth (1972:223) further suggested that educational planning should be correlated with social and economic planning. Hemphill (1970:57) also had this idea in mind when he stated that:

> . . . frequently, educational planning has tended to make situations which were inherently bad, efficiently bad. It is my conviction that we have tended to treat educational problems as different and separate from other social problems. Although education is . . . the most significant lever of power in ameliorating social problems, we cannot continue to plan educational services apart from other people services, such as health, welfare, recreation, and even more importantly, business, industry and technology.

Riffel (1971:7) agreed with Hemphill's contention that educational planning be linked to planning for social, economic, and political development. He added, however, that such a link is essential if the educator is to identify the important needs and trends in society and thereby develop realistic programmes in the school.

A number of individuals have argued that elementary and secondary schools are due for a reorganization of the school year. One such individual was Holt (1973:311) who claimed that some form of longer year utilization of the school's physical resources is inevitable, because of the shortage of money for educational

purposes. Coutts and Bergen (1969:25-26) outlined a plan for high school students, which would provide for two semesters and an optional summer programme. They suggested, however, that the Christmas recess would be a suitable dividing point for the two semesters. Worth (1972:117-120) proposed a reorganization of the school year, based on continuous learning year cycling plans, whereby there are a number of short term learning periods interspersed by brief vacations. Tsitrian (1973) and White (1973) reported the operation of two schools, based on similar models of organization to that outlined by Worth. However, since these schools have been in operation for a short period of time, the evidence in regard to the extent of their success is inconclusive.

Speaking on the topic of reorganization, Patterson (1970:30) asserted that there is a need for "flattening" the organizational structure in the public schools. He maintained that, unless some of this "flattening" is brought about, educators will remain guilty of wasting valuable staff resources at the students' expense. This contention seems to be similar to the non-linear organizational structure that Worth (1972:137) spoke about. Also discussing reorganization was Kammann (1972:37), who proposed that attendance boundaries within the school system be abolished so that the family has a choice of schools. This elimination of boundaries would, according to him, satisfy the diverse requirements of society.

Physical Facilities

There have emerged new trends of thought in recent years

regarding the design of school buildings. Worth (1972:254) has proposed that school buildings be made such that rearrangement would be facilitated whenever necessary. Knezevich (1969:457) pointed out that flexibility in the design of school buildings is one of the significant trends in school-plant planning. He also maintained that flexibility can easily be built into the structure of the building without a great increase in costs.

Boles (1965:259) and Fredrickson (1972:60) contended that there is a need for futuristic planning of school facilities, in order that the rapidly-changing programmes be accommodated in the near future. This planning, according to Edmonton Public Schools Extension Services (1971:68), should be made within the area to be served by the school. They recommended:

> That the planning and design of school facilities be conducted in conjunction with those community, municipal and provincial agencies operating within the community or area to be served to minimize building costs and maximize delivery of services.

Also recommended was the involvement of residents and community groups in the planning and design of the school's facilities. The recommendations made by Edmonton Public Schools Extension Services were upheld by Worth (1972:251) when he asserted that school design decisions be made at the local level.

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING CHANGE

The role of the principal in implementing change has received considerable attention from educational writers. Many educators have contended that the principal is the key change agent in the school.

Novotney (1968:68-72), for example, claimed that the principal is expected to "engineer" change in the school. He also maintained that, in order to help others to come to the realization that change is needed, the principal must show dedication and enthusiasm. Cronin (1963:31) was also of a similar opinion to that of Novotney when he stated that teachers look toward the principal for encouragement to find better ways of helping students learn. He added, however, that once changes are attempted, the principal should provide support for those who are attempting to bring about instructional improvements.

Swaab (1972:57) asserted that the principal is responsible for setting the norm-changing model in his school. In addition, he suggested that it does no good for the principal to encourage teachers to take risks in trying new things, when he does not take any himself. Jacobs (1965:13) was also of the opinion expressed by Swaab, when he pointed out that the most significant factor in bringing about change is the behaviour displayed by the principal in his relationship with the teaching staff.

Tye (1970) agreed with the previous authors that the principal can be an effective change agent at his school, but added that this is so only under certain conditions. Included amongst these conditions are that the principal (1) has self-understanding, (2) is able to deal with conflicting role expectations, (3) is aware of the components of effective leadership, (4) has an understanding of the change process, and (5) is cosmopolitan. Other conditions that are stated by Tye include the importance of the principal (1) being efficient in group dynamics, (2) having

background in administrative theory, and (3) being literate in research literature. The possession of the characteristics included in these conditions will, according to the author, make the principal an effective change agent.

While discussing the principal's role in curriculum development, Stewart (1968:30) maintained that the principal should possess certain competencies that would make up for his lack of classroom proximity. For example, he suggested that the principal should be able to make such decisions that would foster a climate of innovativeness. Also addressing herself to the role of school administrators in curriculum innovations was Hersom (1973:27), who contended that the administrator's role is to coordinate curriculum tasks. She stated:

> The administrator expects to coordinate and facilitate the achievement of the curriculum tasks: he will assign responsibilities, establish communication lines, define project planning and control procedures. In addition, his set of beliefs about the purposes of the school, and the hopes he has for the pupils attending that school will inevitably influence those involved with him in these tasks. There needs to be recognition of human attitudes and values throughout all the stages of curriculum development.

Holdaway and Seger (1967:16) were of the opinion that not only should principals see themselves as important change agents, but that they should be searching for areas in which to innovate. They also pointed out that principals can, by their very practices, have an influence on innovative decisions made by the superintendents and assistant superintendents. Speaking of administrative practices, MacKay (1966:59) outlined four possible roles that the principal may

adopt as a change agent. Included amongst these four roles are (1) content initiator, (2) process initiator, (3) mediator, and (4) squasher. By adopting the role of a content initiator, the principal presents new ideas and clearly supports them. If he adopts the role of a process initiator, he establishes the structure that is conducive for others to search for innovations. When accepting the role of a mediator, the principal works with policy-makers, provides facilities, and encourages other members of the organization to display leadership acts. As a squasher, the principal discourages the dissemination of new ideas, refuses to act, and generally waits for the passing of the demands for change.

The principal, therefore, plays a crucial role in the implementation of change in the school. If he wants to meet the needs of students, staff, and the community by implementing changes such as those proposed by Worth in his Report, he would be wise to first assess his behaviour as a principal. This is because the quality of education can only be improved if the principal creates an environment that is conducive to the improvement of the educational process in the school he administers.

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL'S PERCEPTIONS IN CHANGE IMPLEMENTATION

Several authors have asserted that one's perceptions about the world around him play a crucial role in influencing his behaviour. This point was well illustrated by Wilson et al (1969:165) when they maintained that:

> From perception grows behavior. That is, behavior is a function or expression of perception. What a person does is consistent with the world as he sees it. And how he sees it depends upon his understanding of his past experiences, his beliefs about the world around him, his attitudes, his beliefs about himself and other people, his notions about his worth as a person and the worth of other people, and his assumptions about the nature of people and change. All of these result from a person's interpretation of his experience, and what he does is consistent with these perceptions.

Because perceptions influence the principal's behaviour and help make up the atmosphere in which he functions, Costello and Zalkind (1963:3) suggested that they are crucial in the administrative process. Since they play an important role in determining what behaviour he displays as a leader, his perceptions will influence the degree of success he has as an administrator. They will influence his planning procedures, knowledge of the organization, the kinds of controls he resorts to, and the manner in which he directs the work effort of his group. Enns (1966:23) fully upheld these authors' contention that administrative behaviour is based on the perceptions of the principal and the people involved in the situation. However, he added that perceptions are often not accurate reproductions of reality but rather are distorted and subjective versions of reality.

Morin (1965:18) stressed the importance of accurate role perception for enacting roles successfully. He emphasized that:

> Inaccurate perception is likely to result in behavior which falls short of or misses the central core of the task to be accomplished, and which results in antagonism among influential reference groups, a situation to be avoided by the principal if possible.

He also pointed out that the behaviour of the principal will be

determined by (1) his own perception of his role, (2) his perception of the expectations that his reference groups hold for him, (3) his perception of the requirements of his position, and (4) his desire to provide gratification for his need-dispositions.

Thus, the principal's perceptions play an important role in influencing his behaviour as an administrator in the school. These perceptions, however, are not always accurate representations of reality. Because a principal perceives certain changes proposed by Worth in his Report to be difficult to implement, he may experience greater difficulty in implementing them than he would those changes that he perceives as being easy to implement.

SUMMARY

In summary, a survey of related literature pertinent to some proposals in the Worth Report has been presented. This literature dealt with the task areas of (1) school-community relations, (2) curriculum and instruction, (3) use of community and school resources, (4) staff personnel, (5) system planning and management, and (6) physical facilities.

The review of the literature indicated the necessity for improving the relationship between the school and community that the school serves. One way of improving this relationship, it was suggested, is by involving parents and other laymen in the affairs of the school to a greater extent than is the case at present. Also, suggestions have been made by some writers that greater involvement of parents and students in the educational process will foster the

development of a relevant curriculum for students.

Proposals have been put forth that schools should make greater use of teaching aides and other community resource people. A number of educators have claimed that there should be more effective utilization of staff personnel and that educational planning and management techniques should be made more efficient for the purposes of better utilizing the existing human and technological resources. In addition, some authors have contended that school buildings should be made flexible so that they could be rearranged whenever the need arises.

Finally, a number of writers claimed that the principal is the key change agent in his school, and that his perceptions play an important role in influencing his behaviour as an administrator.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter outlines the research techniques that were employed for the purposes of collecting and analysing data for this study. More specifically, the description includes (1) the design of the questionnaire, (2) the pretesting of the questionnaire, (3) the selection of the sample, (4) the collection of data, and (5) the techniques used for analysing the data.

INSTRUMENTATION

Design of Questionnaire

The instrument used for this study was a questionnaire entitled "School Organization and Operation." This questionnaire, consisting of two parts, was constructed by the researcher. The first part consisted of fifty proposals drawn from the Worth Report, A Choice of Futures, while the second part dealt with the respondents' personal and professional characteristics.

Before the questionnaire was designed the Worth Report was carefully read and a list of proposals that were either explicitly stated or implied in his discussion was made. This original list consisted of seventy proposals that were related to grades one through twelve levels of education in the Province of Alberta. Upon a careful analysis of this list, however, twenty proposals were

discarded because they seemed to lack clarity when taken out of the context of Worth's discussion and could not be used in a questionnaire.

The remaining fifty proposals, which are presented in Table 1 along with the pages of the Report on which they appeared, were then categorized into six task areas on the basis of some of the ideas presented by Campbell et al (1971:136-180) when they proposed a conceptual framework for school administration. Consequently, the task areas that were derived included (1) school-community relations, (2) curriculum and instruction, (3) use of community and school resources, (4) staff personnel, (5) system planning and management, and (6) physical facilities. These task areas are present in part one of the questionnaire in Appendix A.

As indicated in the questionnaire, each of the task areas, with the exception of those pertaining to the use of community and school resources, and physical facilities, contained ten proposals. Each of the other two contained five proposals.

The questionnaire was designed in such a manner that there were three parts to be answered for each proposal. Respondents were asked to indicate (1) the extent to which they agreed with the proposal for change, (2) the significance of the proposal for change, and (3) the feasibility of implementing the proposal. Answers were provided by circling the letter or letters and number on five-point scales, which best represented the respondents' opinions with regard to each part. Also, an opportunity to comment on any proposal was provided. The respondents were asked to place their comments in the

Table 1

Proposals Drawn from the Worth Report and the Pages on which They Appear

	Proposal	Page Number
1.	Citizens should be involved to a greater extent in setting goals for schools.*	123
2.	Records of decision-making within the school system, such as budget allocations, should be made accessible to the public.*	123
3.	Each school should have a school council consisting of parents and other laymen, students, teachers, and administrators.**	126-127
4.	School councils should have the power to establish important policy decisions regarding the programme of studies.**	127
5.	School councils should determine budget priorities.**	127
6.	School councils should develop school regulations such as discipline and dress.**	127
7.	School councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved.**	127
8.	School councils should be used as recruiting agents for adult volunteers from the community for purposes of non-instructional duties.*	127
9.	School councils should communicate community-school needs and concerns to school boards.**	127
10.	Schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities in their respective communities.**	253

Table 1 (continued)

	Proposal	Page Number
11.	Greater differentiation should be provided with respect to course offerings.**	70
12.	Greater differentiation should be provided with respect to teaching methods.**	70
13.	Teaching methods should be individual-centred.*	156-157
14.	Teachers and learners should mutually develop performance objectives.**	197
15.	Students should be evaluated on the basis of performance objectives.**	197
16.	Students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is appropriate for their purposes.*	155-157
17.	Greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies.**	189-191
18.	Course content should focus on the interests and concerns of students.*	156-157
19.	Mastery learning, as perceived by Bloom and his disciples, should be stressed.**	207
20.	Power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools.**	205
21.	Work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided.**	177-180
22.	Volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized.**	241-243

Table 1 (continued)

	Proposal	Page Number
23.	Differentiated staffing should include community resource people.***	242
24.	School administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems.*	260-261
25.	Present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished.**	71
26.	When no suitably qualified professional, trainee, or volunteer is available, school districts should have the authority to employ whomever they wish.**	242
27.	Schools should be staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs.**	237
28.	Permanent certification of teachers should be abolished.***	245
29.	Teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community.**	123
30.	Teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results.**	247
31.	Teacher role should shift from a director-imparter to a guide-consultant.**	212
32.	Counselling services available to teachers-in-training should be improved and increased to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers.***	238
33.	Distinguished teachers should be encouraged to remain in teaching rather than accepting administrative positions.**	244

Table 1 (continued)

	Proposal	Page Number
34.	Staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy.*	70
35.	Special professional personnel, such as speech therapists and psychologists, should not be required to have teaching certificates.**	245
36.	Planning should be carried out in accordance with the principle of efficiency.**	221
37.	School budget time-frame should be lengthened from one year to three years for operating and five years for capital budgets.***	271
38.	Excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes.*	220
39.	Conventional units of school organization; that is, Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High, should be phased out.*	71
40.	Reorganization of the school year should be based on continuous learning year cycling plans whereby there are a number of short term learning periods interspersed by brief vacations.***	117
41.	Special attention should be given to costing in the design and evaluation of programmes.***	221
42.	Educational planning should be correlated with general social and economic planning.***	223
43.	Expenditures should be related more directly to the objectives that programmes purport to achieve.**	229

Table 1 (continued)

Proposal	Page Number
44. Opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided.*	116-120
45. Organizational structures within the school should be less hierarchical in nature than they are at present.*	137, 144
46. Design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary.**	254
47. School design decisions should be made at the local level.***	251
48. Certain schools should be designed as area schools offering services to neighbouring schools.**	70
49. Buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community.***	251
50. Greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings.**	254

*These proposals were implied to some extent on the pages indicated and throughout various contexts in the Report.

**These proposals were clearly implied in the Report on the pages indicated.

***These proposals were clearly stated in the Report on the pages indicated.

spaces directly beneath their encircled answers. For example, the first two proposals in the task area of school-community relations were stated in the following manner:

1. Citizens should be involved to a greater extent in setting goals for schools.

2. Records of decision-making within the school system, such as budget allocations, should be made accessible to the public.

The principals reacted to these proposals by circling their answers on the following five-point scales:

EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
1. SA A U D SD	1. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	1. VE E U D VD
2. SA A U D SD	2. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	2. VE E U D VD

In the second part of the questionnaire, principals were asked to place a check mark in the space provided. This part was designed for the purposes of collecting personal data such as age, sex, total number of years of administrative experience, and other details.

Pretest of Questionnaire

In his discussion of the importance of pretesting the questionnaire, Good (1972:234) stated:

> Before the final form is prepared and distributed to the respondents, tryout or pretesting of the questionnaire is essential, for the purpose of validation in terms of practical use. This tryout probably will lead to revision of certain questions,

deletion of useless questions, and addition of other items.

Good's suggestions were adhered to by the researcher; the questionnaire was pretested by asking thirteen graduate students in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta, and nine principals in the Edmonton Public School System to answer the questionnaire and provide comments for revision purposes. Upon an analysis of the responses to the items and the comments made by these two groups of respondents, the decision was made to revise nine proposals because of some ambiguity in wording. These proposals included numbers (1) two, (2) twenty-five, (3) twenty-six, (4) thirty-two, (5) thirty-five, (6) thirty-seven, (7) forty, (8) forty-five, and (9) fifty. Also, the set of instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire was revised for the purposes of greater clarity.

THE SAMPLE

For the purpose of this study, a stratified random sample of 450 principals in the Province of Alberta was taken. Proportionately included in the sample were principals of schools with six different grade organizations, namely (1) Elementary, (2) Elementary-Junior High, (3) Elementary-Junior-Senior High, (4) Junior High, (5) Junior-Senior High, and (6) Senior High.

The stratified random sampling procedure requires knowledge of the number of members in each of the various categories of the population. In order to arrive at these numbers, a directory entitled "List of Operating Schools in Alberta" for the 1972-73

school year was obtained from the Operational Research Branch, Department of Education in Edmonton, Alberta. On the basis of the list of schools, and the grade levels being taught at the schools, categories of the various grade organizations were derived. As indicated in Table 2, the number of schools in each category served as the basis for further calculations in deriving the representative sample, which consisted of approximately one third of the total population of principals administering grades one through twelve in Alberta.

In order to ensure that each principal in the province had an equal opportunity of participating in the study, the random sampling procedure using a table of random numbers was implemented. First, however, the principals were identified by the code numbers assigned to their schools in the directory. Then, various combinations of random numbers, provided by Dixon and Massey (1969:446-450), were read. This reading of numbers was carried out until a sufficient number of principals were identified for each grade organization.

COLLECTION OF DATA

A copy of the questionnaire was mailed to each of (1) one hundred seventy-five Elementary, (2) one hundred forty-nine Elementary-Junior High, (3) forty-five Elementary-Junior-Senior High, (4) twenty-seven Junior High, (5) twenty-seven Junior-Senior High, and (6) twenty-seven Senior High school principals.

Accompanying the questionnaire was a brief letter asking for the principal's cooperation in responding to the proposals and

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Principals in Each Grade Organization, and Number of Principals in Representative Sample

Category	Number of Principals	Percent of Total Population	Representative Sample*
Elementary	522	39	175
Elementary-Junior High	438	33	149
Elementary-Junior-Senior High	137	10	45
Junior High	76	6	27
Junior-Senior High	75	6	27
Senior High	83	6	27
Total	1,331	100	450**

*The numbers for each grade organization in the representative sample were calculated by using 450 as the size of the total sample.

**This number was rounded off to the nearest 50.

explaining the purpose of the study. However, in an attempt to minimize possible biased reactions to the Worth Report, no mention was made about the source of the items. Instead, the brief explanation given in the letter suggested that these proposals were based on some of the recent literature on school organization and operation. Also, included with the questionnaire was a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Table 3 shows that of the total number of questionnaires sent, 80.2 percent were returned; of these 92.0 percent were usable. Some questionnaires were not usable because they were incompletely answered. Table 3 also indicates that the highest response came from the Senior High school principals, while the lowest came from the Elementary-Junior High school principals. The response rate was 96.3 percent for the former group and 76.5 percent for the latter group.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The encircled responses to the agreement and ease of implementation scales were converted to numbers for the purposes of weighting. Thus, for part one of the encircled responses to the proposals dealing with the extent of agreement, the response of strongly agree was assigned a numerical value of five and the values progressively decreased until a numerical value of one was assigned to the response of strongly disagree. Likewise, for part three of the answers, dealing with ease of implementation, the response of very easy was assigned a numerical value of five and the response of very difficult a value of one. The second part of the encircled

Table 3

Number of Principals Contacted, Number of Returned Questionnaires, and Number Used for the Study

Category	Number Contacted	Number Returned	Percent Returned	Number Used	Percent Used*
Elementary	175	135	77.1	117	86.7
Elementary-Junior High	149	114	76.5	109	95.6
Elementary-Junior-Senior High	45	39	86.6	37	94.9
Junior High	27	25	92.6	23	92.0
Junior-Senior High	27	22	81.5	21	95.5
Senior High	27	26	96.3	25	96.2
Total	450	361	80.2	332	92.0

*These percentages were calculated on the basis of the number of questionnaires returned.

answers, dealing with the significance of the proposals, was not altered. Here, the respondents answered on a five-point scale going from highly significant to not significant. The terms highly significant and not significant, for example, were already assigned the values of five and one respectively.

Once the data were scored in the manner just described, a transfer of the numbers was made to computer cards. The first analysis was conducted for the purposes of obtaining a one-way frequency distribution. From this data, it was possible to derive several subgroups of principals, in addition to the subgroups based on grade organization, by collapsing certain response categories. These subgroups, whose formation was necessary for conducting an analysis of the subproblems, were determined on the basis of (1) age, (2) urban and rural localities, (3) school type, (4) years of teacher education, (5) amount of graduate training, (6) years of experience as principal, and (7) size of school. An outline of these subgroups is presented in Table 4.

Next, the percentage frequencies, which are reported in Appendix C, and the means were calculated for each of the proposals within each task area, pertaining to the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation. On the basis of the means, all the items within each task area were ranked for each category of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation. This ranking was done for the total group of principals and for each of the various subgroups of principals. In addition, the ranks for the total group of principals in the sample were tabulated for all fifty

Table 4

Characteristics of Principals in the Sample

Characteristics	Subgroup*	Number	Percent
Sex	Male	294	88.5
	Female	38	11.4
Age	35 Years or Less	98	29.5
	36-50 Years	157	47.2
	51 or More Years	77	23.2
Urban-Rural	Urban--Population over 100,000	104	31.3
	Urban--Population 1,000-100,000	110	33.1
	Rural--Population under 1,000	118	35.5
Type of School	City Public and Separate	163	49.1
	Division or County	169	50.9
Teacher Education	4.9 Years or Less	160	48.2
	5-5.9 Years	79	23.8
	6 Years or More	93	28.0
Graduate Training	No Graduate Training	138	41.6
	Some Graduate Training	106	31.9
	Diploma or More	88	26.5
Experience as Principal	2 or Less Years	83	25.0
	3-5 Years	84	25.3
	6-10 Years	67	20.2
	11 or More Years	98	29.5
Size of School	9 or Less Teachers	96	28.9
	10-19 Teachers	132	39.8
	20 or More Teachers	104	31.3

*For a further explanation of the subgroups, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

items, thereby excluding the divisions created by the task areas.

In part three of the analysis, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was calculated to determine the relationship amongst the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation. This procedure was followed for each task area. Also, the coefficient of concordance was calculated to determine the extent of agreement amongst principals of various subgroups in regard to the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation of the proposals.

The value of using Kendall's coefficient of concordance is well illustrated by Siegel (1956:239) when he stated:

> The Kendall coefficient of concordance W measures the extent of association among several (K) sets of rankings on N entities. It is useful in determining the agreement among several judges or the associations among three or more variables. It has special applications in providing a standard method of ordering entities according to consensus when there is available no objective order of the entities.

When there is complete agreement among judges in the ranks they assign, the coefficient of concordance is equal to one. However, when there is total disagreement among judges, the coefficient of concordance is equal to zero.

In order to test the significance of the observed values for the coefficient of concordance, a chi square test was applied. This test determines the probability of occurrence, under the null hypothesis, of the observed agreement among judges on the basis of chance.

SUMMARY

For the purposes of this study, a questionnaire consisting of fifty proposals from the Worth Report was designed. This instrument was pretested and then administered to 450 principals in the Province of Alberta. An analysis was conducted whereby means were calculated for each of the fifty proposals; then, each of the proposals was ranked on the basis of the means. For the purposes of determining the extent of agreement among principals of various categories and the degree of concordance amongst the three sets of the responses pertaining to agreement, significance, and ease of implementation, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was calculated.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR THE TOTAL GROUP OF PRINCIPALS

This chapter presents the research findings for the total group of principals from which data were collected and analysed. Some evidence is provided about (1) the degree to which principals agreed with various proposals put forth in the Worth Report, (2) the extent to which they perceived the proposals to be significant for change, and (3) the extent to which they perceived implementation of the proposals to be feasible.

First, the description deals with the findings that are relevant to each task area. Then, the research findings based on all fifty proposals are discussed. Finally, the discussion centres on the relationship among the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation.

FINDINGS FOR EACH TASK AREA

This section presents the proposals with the highest ranks and those with the lowest ranks in each of the task areas on (1) the extent of agreement expressed by principals with various proposals, (2) the extent to which principals perceived the proposals to be significant for change, and (3) the degree to which they perceived implementation of the proposals to be feasible. The procedure of making reference to the extreme ends of the rank order is followed

throughout this portion of the chapter.

School-Community Relations

Agreement. Table 5 indicates that principals expressed the greatest degree of agreement with the proposals that (1) schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities in their respective communities, (2) school councils should communicate community-school needs and concerns to school boards, and (3) records of decision-making within the school system, such as budget allocations, should be made accessible to the public. These three proposals ranked 1, 2, and 3 respectively, and had means ranging from 4.19 to 3.85.

The principals indicated least agreement with the proposals that (1) school councils should determine budget priorities, (2) school councils should have the power to establish important policy decisions regarding the programme of studies, (3) school councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved, and (4) school councils should develop school regulations such as discipline and dress. These four proposals ranked 10, 9, 8, and 7 respectively, and had means ranging from 2.49 to 2.96.

Significance. Principals perceived the proposals that schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities in their respective communities, and that school councils should communicate community-school needs and concerns to school boards, to be most significant for change in the

Table 5

Means and Ranks of Proposals in the School-Community Relations Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Citizens should be involved in setting school goals.	3.63	4	3.48	3	2.19	9
2. Records of decision-making should be made accessible to the public.	3.85	3	3.32	5	3.62	1
3. Each school should have a school council.	3.45	5	3.41	4	2.84	5
4. School councils should establish policy decisions regarding the programme of studies.	2.62	9	3.11	7	2.28	8
5. School councils should determine budget priorities.*	2.49	10	2.98	9	2.39	7
6. School councils should develop school regulations.	2.96	7	2.95	10	2.78	6
7. School councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved.*	2.85	8	3.09	8	2.12	10

Table 5 (continued)

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
8. School councils should be used as recruiting agents for adult volunteers.	3.22	6	3.13	6	3.03	3
9. School councils should communicate community-school needs to school boards.	3.86	2	3.78	2	3.38	2
10. Schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities.	4.19	1	4.07	1	2.96	4

*These proposals have not been shortened. For the exact wording of the other proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

task area of school-community relations. These proposals ranked 1 and 2 respectively, and had means of 4.07 and 3.78.

Of least perceived significance for change were the proposals that (1) school councils should develop school regulations such as discipline and dress, (2) school councils should determine budget priorities, (3) school councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved, (4) school councils should have the power to establish important policy decisions regarding the programme of studies, and (5) school councils should be used as recruiting agents for adult volunteers from the community for purposes of non-instructional duties. The ranks of these proposals, as shown in Table 5, were 10, 9, 8, 7, and 6 respectively, and the means ranged from 2.95 to 3.13.

Ease of implementation. As indicated in Table 5, Alberta principals perceived the proposals that records of decision-making within the school system, such as budget allocations, should be made accessible to the public, and that school councils should communicate community-school needs and concerns to school boards, as being most feasible to implement. These proposals ranked 1 and 2 respectively in the category of ease of implementation, and had means of 3.62 and 3.38.

The principals perceived to be least feasible to implement the proposals that (1) school councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved, (2) citizens should be involved to a greater extent in setting goals for schools, (3) school councils

should have the power to establish important policy decisions regarding the programme of studies, and (4) school councils should determine budget priorities. These proposals ranked 10, 9, 8, and 7 respectively, and had means ranging from 2.12 to 2.39.

Curriculum and Instruction

Agreement. In the task area of curriculum and instruction, principals agreed most with the proposals that greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies, and that teaching methods should be individual-centred. As shown in Table 6, these two proposals ranked 1 and 2, and had means of 4.15 and 4.10 respectively.

They indicated least agreement with the proposal that students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is appropriate for their purposes. This proposal had a rank order of 10 and a mean of 2.15. Two other proposals that principals expressed least agreement with were those stating that power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools, and that mastery learning as perceived by Bloom and his disciples should be stressed. The ranks of these two proposals were 9 and 8 respectively, and their means were 3.10 and 3.34.

Significance. As was the case in the category of agreement, principals perceived to be most significant the proposals that teaching methods should be individual-centred, and that greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies. These two proposals

Table 6

Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Curriculum and Instruction Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
11. Greater differentiation should be provided with respect to course offerings.	3.60	7	3.61	7	2.65	8
12. Greater differentiation should be provided with respect to teaching methods.	3.87	3	3.75	4	2.74	6
13. Teaching methods should be individual-centred.	4.10	2	4.09	1	2.34	10
14. Teachers and learners should mutually develop performance objectives.	3.75	5	3.65	6	2.73	7
15. Students should be evaluated on the basis of performance objectives.	3.84	4	3.78	3	2.96	3

Table 6 (continued)

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
16. Students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is necessary.*	2.15	10	3.01	10	2.64	9
17. Greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies.	4.15	1	4.00	2	3.52	1
18. Course content should focus on the interests and concerns of students.	3.65	6	3.68	5	2.92	4
19. Mastery learning should be stressed.*	3.34	8	3.18	8	2.84	5
20. Power tests should be used to assess the level of achievement in schools.*	3.10	9	3.06	9	3.38	2

*These proposals have been shortened. For the exact wording of these proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

ranked 1 and 2 respectively, and had means of 4.09 and 4.00.

The least significance was attributed by the principals to the proposals that (1) students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is appropriate for their purposes, (2) power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools, and (3) mastery learning as perceived by Bloom and his disciples should be stressed. Table 6 shows that these three proposals ranked 10, 9, and 8 respectively, and their means ranged from 3.01 to 3.18.

Ease of implementation. The principals perceived to be most feasible to implement the proposals that greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies, and that power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools. These two proposals ranked 1 and 2 respectively, and had means of 3.52 and 3.38.

Of least perceived feasibility to implement was the proposal that teaching methods should be individual-centred. Table 6 shows that this proposal had a rank order of 10 and a mean of 2.34. This mean was well below the clustered means of the remaining seven proposals.

Use of Community and School Resources

Agreement. In this task area, principals expressed greatest agreement with the proposal that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided. This proposal had a

mean of 4.18 and a rank order of 1.

As shown in Table 7, the least agreement was indicated with the proposals that present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished, and that school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems. These two proposals ranked 5 and 4 respectively, and had means of 3.23 and 3.50.

Significance. Table 7 shows that principals perceived to be most significant the proposal that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided. This proposal had a mean of 3.90 and a rank order of 1. The same rank order was also stated for this proposal in the category of agreement.

Of least perceived significance were the proposals, although in reversed rank order, with which principals expressed least agreement. These proposals stated that school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems, and that present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished. The means for these two proposals were 3.10 and 3.24 respectively, and they ranked 5 and 4.

Ease of implementation. Principals perceived to be most feasible to implement the proposal that present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished. This proposal had a rank order of 1 and a mean of 3.05.

Table 7

Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Task Area Pertaining to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
21. Work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided.	4.18	1	3.90	1	2.73	4
22. Volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized.	3.69	3	3.62	2	2.92	3
23. Differentiated staffing should include community resource people.	3.71	2	3.61	3	2.95	2
24. School administrators should make use of computerized scheduling.*	3.50	4	3.10	5	2.68	5
25. Present attendance boundaries should be abolished.*	3.23	5	3.24	4	3.05	1

*These proposals have been shortened. For the exact wording of these proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

As indicated in Table 7, principals perceived to be least feasible to implement the proposals that school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems, and that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided. These two proposals ranked 5 and 4 respectively, and had means of 2.68 and 2.73.

Staff Personnel

Agreement. Table 8 shows that principals indicated most agreement with the proposals that (1) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy, (2) counselling services available to teachers-in-training should be improved and increased to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers, (3) schools should be staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs, and (4) distinguished teachers should be encouraged to remain in teaching rather than accepting administrative positions. These proposals ranked 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively, and had means ranging from 4.18 to 3.88.

The principals expressed least agreement, however, with the proposal that teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results. This proposal had a rank order of 10 and a mean of 1.65 which was considerably below the means of the remaining five proposals.

Significance. As indicated in Table 8, Alberta school

Table 8

Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Staff Personnel Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
26. School districts should be able to employ whomever they wish.	2.11	8	3.42	6	2.78	6
27. Schools should be staffed on the basis of learner needs.	4.00	3	3.83	3	2.58	8
28. Permanent certification of teachers should be abolished.*	2.18	7	3.38	7	2.79	5
29. Teacher competence should be reappraised by the community.	2.02	9	3.05	9	1.74	9
30. Teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results.*	1.65	10	3.00	10	1.48	10
31. Teacher role should shift from a director-imparter to a guide-consultant.*	3.65	5	3.66	5	2.68	7

Table 8 (continued)

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
32. Counselling services should be improved to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers.	4.04	2	3.76	4	3.06	3
33. Distinguished teachers should be encouraged to remain in teaching.	3.88	4	3.97	1	2.85	4
34. Staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy.*	4.18	1	3.96	2	3.33	1
35. Special professional personnel should not be required to have teaching certificates.	3.01	6	3.37	8	3.27	2

*These proposals have not been shortened. For the exact wording of the other proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

principals perceived to be most significant the proposals that (1) distinguished teachers should be encouraged to remain in teaching rather than accepting administrative positions, (2) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy, (3) schools should be staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs, (4) counselling services available to teachers-in-training should be improved and increased to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers, and (5) teacher role should shift from a director-imparter to a guide-consultant. The ranks for these five proposals were 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively, and the means ranged from 3.97 to 3.66.

The principals perceived the proposals that teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results, and that teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community, to be least significant. Table 8 shows that the means for these two proposals were 3.00 and 3.05 respectively, and their ranks were 10 and 9.

Ease of implementation. Principals perceived to be most feasible to implement the proposals which stated that (1) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy, (2) special professional personnel, such as speech therapists and psychologists, should not be required to have teaching certificates, and (3) counselling services available to teachers-in-training should be improved and increased to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers. These three proposals ranked 1, 2, and 3 respectively, and

had means of 3.33, 3.27, and 3.06.

The two proposals that principals perceived to be least feasible to implement were those which stated that teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results, and that teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community. These two proposals ranked 10 and 9 respectively, and had means of 1.48 and 1.74. These means were considerably lower than those of the remaining five proposals. Further, as was previously discussed, principals also perceived these two proposals to be least significant in this task area.

System Planning and Management

Agreement. In the task area of system planning and management, principals expressed the greatest degree of agreement with the proposals that (1) educational planning should be correlated with general social and economic planning, (2) expenditures should be related more directly to the objectives that programmes purport to achieve, (3) special attention should be given to costing in the design and evaluation of programmes, and (4) planning should be carried out in accordance with the principle of efficiency. These four proposals ranked 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively, and had means ranging from 3.90 to 3.66.

The principals indicated least agreement with the proposal that excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes. This proposal, as shown in Table 9, had a rank order of 10 and a mean of 2.35. Two

Table 9

Means and Ranks of Proposals in the System Planning and Management Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
36. Planning should be carried out in accordance with the principle of efficiency.*	3.66	4	3.66	2	3.00	2
37. School budget time-frame should be lengthened.	3.23	5	3.31	6	3.72	1
38. Excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending existing programmes.	2.35	10	2.85	10	2.82	4
39. Conventional units of school organization should be phased out.	2.75	8	3.09	7	2.58	8
40. Reorganization of the school year should be based on continuous learning year cycling plans.	3.03	7	3.40	5	2.31	9

Table 9 (continued)

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
41. Special attention should be given to costing in the design of programmes.	3.67	3	3.60	3	2.92	3
42. Educational planning should be correlated with social and economic planning.	3.90	1	3.72	1	2.71	7
43. Expenditures should be related to programme objectives.	3.74	2	3.53	4	2.73	6
44. Opportunity for learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided.	2.46	9	2.86	9	2.29	10
45. Organizational structures within the school should be less hierarchical in nature.	3.06	6	-3.05	8	2.77	5

*This proposal has not been shortened. For the exact wording of the other proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

other proposals that principals expressed least agreement with stated that opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided, and that conventional units of school organization; that is, Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High, should be phased out. These proposals ranked 9 and 8 respectively, and had means of 2.46 and 2.75.

Significance. Principals also perceived to be of greatest significance the proposals that (1) educational planning should be correlated with general social and economic planning, (2) planning should be carried out in accordance with the principle of efficiency, (3) special attention should be given to costing in the design and evaluation of programmes, and (4) expenditures should be related more directly to the objectives that programmes purport to achieve. The ranks of these four proposals were 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively, and their means ranged from 3.72 to 3.53.

Of least perceived significance, as indicated in Table 9, were the proposals that excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes, and that opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided. These two proposals ranked 10 and 9 respectively, and had means of 2.85 and 2.86.

Ease of implementation. Table 9 shows that principals perceived to be most feasible to implement the proposal that school budget time-frame should be lengthened from one year to three years for operating and five years for capital budgets. This proposal had

a rank order of 1 and a mean of 3.72. The mean was considerably higher than the means of the other nine proposals.

Alberta school principals perceived to be least feasible to implement the proposals stating that (1) opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided, (2) reorganization of the school year should be based on continuous learning year cycling plans whereby there are a number of short term learning periods interspersed by brief vacations, and (3) conventional units of school organization; that is, Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High, should be phased out. These three proposals ranked 10, 9, and 8 respectively, and had means of 2.29, 2.31, and 2.58.

Physical Facilities

Agreement. Table 10 indicates that in the task area of physical facilities, principals expressed greatest agreement with the proposals that buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community, and that design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary. These two proposals ranked 1 and 2, and had means of 4.26 and 4.15 respectively.

Principals expressed least agreement with the proposal that greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings. This proposal had a rank order of 5 and a mean of 3.28.

Significance. As was the case in the category of agreement,

Table 10

Means and Ranks of Proposals in the Physical Facilities Task Area, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal	Agreement		Significance		Ease of Implementation	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
46. School buildings should be made rearrangeable.	4.15	2	3.93	2	2.49	5
47. School design decisions should be made at the local level.*	3.78	4	3.73	3	2.96	4
48. Certain schools should be designed as area schools.	3.90	3	3.68	4	3.09	3
49. Buildings for schooling should be designed for continuous use by all members of the community.	4.26	1	4.08	1	3.24	1
50. Greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings.*	3.28	5	3.17	5	3.22	2

*These proposals have not been shortened. For the exact wording of the other proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

principals perceived the proposals that buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community, and that design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary, to be of greatest significance. The means for these two proposals were 4.08 and 3.93 respectively, and their ranks were 1 and 2.

Also, as they did on agreement, principals perceived the proposal that greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings to be least significant. The rank order of this proposal was 5, and its mean was 3.17.

Ease of implementation. Principals perceived to be most feasible to implement the proposals that buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community, and that greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings. These two proposals ranked 1 and 2 respectively, and had means of 3.24 and 3.22.

The proposal, design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary, was perceived the least feasible to implement. This proposal had a rank order of 5 and a mean of 2.49.

OVERALL FINDINGS FOR THE FIFTY PROPOSALS

The discussion in this section of the chapter deals with how

the proposals from the various task areas relate to all fifty proposals. More specifically, the description presents the proposals from the six different task areas that ranked amongst the highest and those that ranked amongst the lowest in the overall ranking of the fifty proposals in each category of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation. First, the highest ranked proposals are presented; then the lowest ranked proposals are outlined. This procedure is followed throughout the writing of this section.

Highest Ranked Proposals on Agreement

Table 11 shows that the task area of school-community relations had one proposal ranked amongst the top eleven proposals in the overall ranking on agreement. This proposal (10) stated that schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities in their respective communities. The mean for this proposal was 4.19 and it had a rank order of 2. Also indicated in Table 11, is that the task area of curriculum and instruction had two proposals ranked amongst the top eleven proposals, and that the task area pertaining to use of community and school resources had one proposal in the top ranking. The two proposals (13, 17) from the former task area were those stating that teaching methods should be individual-centred, and that greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies. These two proposals ranked 7 and 5.5 respectively, and had means of 4.10 and 4.15. The proposal (21) from the latter task area ranked 3.5, and had a mean of 4.18. It stated that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be

Table 11

Means and Ranks of All Proposals, in the Category of Agreement, Based on Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Task Area and Proposal Number*	Mean	Rank
School-Community Relations		
1.	3.63	26
2.	3.85	15
3.	3.45	29
4.	2.62	42
5.	2.49	43
6.	2.96	39
7.	2.85	40
8.	3.22	34
9.	3.86	14
10.	4.19	2
Curriculum and Instruction		
11.	3.60	27
12.	3.87	13
13.	4.10	7
14.	3.75	18
15.	3.84	16
16.	2.15	47
17.	4.15	5.5
18.	3.65	24.5
19.	3.34	30
20.	3.10	35
Use of Community and School Resources		
21.	4.18	3.5
22.	3.69	21
23.	3.71	20
24.	3.50	28
25.	3.23	32.5
Staff Personnel		
26.	2.11	48
27.	4.00	9
28.	2.18	46
29.	2.02	49
30.	1.65	50

Table 11 (continued)

Task Area and Proposal Number	Mean	Rank	Task Area and Proposal Number	Mean	Rank
31.	3.65	24.5	41.	3.67	22
32.	4.04	8	42.	3.90	10.5
33.	3.88	12	43.	3.74	19
34.	4.18	3.5	44.	2.46	44
35.	3.01	38	45.	3.06	36
System Planning and Management			Physical Facilities		
36.	3.66	23	46.	4.15	5.5
37.	3.23	32.5	47.	3.78	17
38.	2.35	45	48.	3.90	10.5
39.	2.75	41	49.	4.26	1
40.	3.03	37	50.	3.28	31

*For the content of the proposals, refer to the previous tables or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

provided.

Included in the task area of staff personnel, were three proposals (27, 32, 34) that ranked amongst the top eleven proposals in the overall ranking. These proposals stated that (1) schools should be staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs, (2) counselling services available to teachers-in-training should be improved and increased to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers, and (3) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy. These three proposals ranked 9, 8, and 3.5 respectively, and had means ranging from 4.00 to 4.18.

The task area of system planning and management had one proposal (42) amongst the top eleven proposals in the ranking. This proposal ranked 10.5 and had a mean of 3.90. It stated that educational planning should be correlated with general social and economic planning. Further, the task area of physical facilities had three proposals (46, 48, 49) amongst the top ranking. These proposals stated that (1) design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary, (2) certain schools should be designed as area schools offering services to neighbouring schools, and (3) buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community. The ranks for these three proposals, as shown in Table 11, were 5.5, 10.5, and 1 respectively, and their means were 4.15, 3.90, and 4.26.

In sum, the task areas of school-community relations, use of community and school resources, and system planning and management

each had one proposal amongst the top eleven ranks in the overall ranking of the fifty proposals. Also, the task area of curriculum and instruction had two proposals included in the top ranking, while the task areas of staff personnel, and physical facilities each had three.

Lowest Ranked Proposals on Agreement

As indicated in Table 11, the task area of school-community relations had two proposals (4, 5) ranked amongst the lowest ten proposals in the overall ranking of the fifty proposals on agreement. These proposals stated that school councils should have the power to establish important policy decisions regarding the programme of studies, and that school councils should determine budget priorities. The means for these two proposals were 2.62 and 2.49 respectively, and they ranked 42 and 43. Also shown in Table 11, is that the task area of curriculum and instruction had one proposal (16) ranked amongst the lowest ten proposals, and that the task areas concerning use of community and school resources, and physical facilities did not have any proposals ranked amongst the lowest ones. The proposal that ranked amongst the lowest in the former task area of curriculum and instruction, however, was the one which stated that students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is appropriate for their purposes. This proposal had a rank order of 47 and a mean of 2.15.

The task area of staff personnel had four proposals (26, 28, 29, 30) included amongst the lowest ranking. These proposals stated

that (1) when no suitably qualified professional, trainee, or volunteer is available, school districts should have the authority to employ whomever they wish, (2) permanent certification of teachers should be abolished, (3) teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community, and (4) teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results. The means for these proposals ranged from 2.18 to 1.65, and they ranked 48, 46, 49, and 50 respectively.

Table 11 also indicates that the task area of system planning and management had three proposals (38, 39, 44) included amongst the lowest ten ranked proposals. The first of these three ranked proposals stated that excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes, while the other two stated that conventional units of school organization; that is, Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High, should be phased out, and that opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided. These three proposals ranked 45, 41, and 44 respectively, and had means of 2.35, 2.75, and 2.46.

Thus, the task areas of (1) school-community relations had two proposals amongst the lowest ranking, (2) curriculum and instruction had one proposal in the lowest overall ranking, (3) staff personnel had four proposals amongst the lowest ranking, and (4) system planning and management had three proposals with lowest rank orders. However, the task areas dealing with use of community and school resources, and physical facilities did not have any

proposals ranked amongst the lowest ten in the overall ranking.

Highest Ranked Proposals on Significance

The task area of school-community relations had two proposals (9, 10) ranked amongst the top eleven proposals in the category of significance. As shown in Table 12, these two proposals ranked 10.5 and 3 respectively, and had means of 3.78 and 4.07. The proposals stated that school councils should communicate community-school needs and concerns to school boards, and that schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities in their respective communities.

Table 12 also shows that the task area of curriculum and instruction had three proposals (13, 15, 17) ranked amongst the top eleven proposals. These proposals stated that (1) teaching methods should be individual-centred, (2) students should be evaluated on the basis of performance objectives, and (3) greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies. The proposals ranked 1, 10.5, and 4 respectively, and had means of 4.09, 3.78, and 4.00. Furthermore, the task area concerning use of community and school resources had one proposal (21) with a rank order of 8. This proposal had a mean of 3.90, and stated that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided.

As indicated in Table 12, the task area of staff personnel had three proposals (27, 33, 34) included amongst the top eleven proposals in the overall ranking. The means of these three proposals ranged from 3.83 to 3.97, and they ranked 9, 5, and 6 respectively.

Table 12

Means and Ranks of All Proposals, in the Category of Significance, Based on Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Task Area and Proposal Number*	Mean	Rank
School-Community Relations		
1.	3.48	26
2.	3.32	32
3.	3.41	28
4.	3.11	38
5.	2.98	47
6.	2.95	48
7.	3.09	40.5
8.	3.13	37
9.	3.78	10.5
10.	4.07	3
Curriculum and Instruction		
11.	3.61	22.5
12.	3.75	13
13.	4.09	1
14.	3.65	20
15.	3.78	10.5
16.	3.01	45
17.	4.00	4
18.	3.68	16.5
19.	3.18	35
20.	3.06	42
Use of Community and School Resources		
21.	3.90	8
22.	3.62	21
23.	3.61	22.5
24.	3.10	39
25.	3.24	34
Staff Personnel		
26.	3.42	27
27.	3.83	9
28.	3.38	30
29.	3.05	43.5
30.	3.00	46

Table 12 (continued)

Task Area and Proposal Number	Mean	Rank	Task Area and Proposal Number	Mean	Rank
31.	3.66	18.5	41.	3.60	24
32.	3.76	12	42.	3.72	15
33.	3.97	5	43.	3.53	25
34.	3.86	6	44.	2.86	49
35.	3.37	31	45.	3.05	43.5
System Planning and Management			Physical Facilities		
36.	3.66	18.5	46.	3.93	7
37.	3.31	33	47.	3.73	14
38.	2.85	50	48.	3.68	16.5
39.	3.09	40.5	49.	4.08	2
40.	3.40	29	50.	3.17	36

*For the content of the proposals, refer to the previous tables or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

These proposals stated that (1) schools should be staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs, (2) distinguished teachers should be encouraged to remain in teaching rather than accepting administrative positions, and (3) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy.

There were no proposals from the task area dealing with system planning and management included amongst the top eleven. Two proposals (46, 49), however, were included from the task area of physical facilities. These two proposals ranked 7 and 2 respectively, and had means of 3.93 and 4.08. They stated that design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary, and that buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community.

In summary, the task area of school-community relations had two proposals included amongst the top eleven ranks in the category of significance, while the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and staff personnel each had three. Moreover, the task area referring to use of community and school resources had one proposal in the top overall ranking; the task area relating to physical facilities had two; and the task area of system planning and management had none.

Lowest Ranked Proposals on Significance

Table 12 shows that the task area of school-community relations had three proposals (5, 6, 7) included amongst the lowest

eleven proposals in the overall ranking of the fifty items in the category of significance. These proposals ranked 47, 48, and 40.5 respectively, and had means ranging from 2.95 to 3.09. They stated that (1) school councils should determine budget priorities, (2) school councils should develop school regulations such as discipline and dress, and (3) school councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved. Further, Table 12 indicates that the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and staff personnel each had two proposals amongst the lowest eleven in the ranking. In the former task area, the proposals (16, 20) stated that students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is appropriate for their purposes, and that power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools. These two proposals ranked 45 and 42 respectively, and had means of 3.01 and 3.06. In the latter task area of staff personnel, the proposals (29, 30) stated that teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community, and that teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results. The means for these two proposals were 3.05 and 3.00 respectively, and they ranked 43.5 and 46.

The task areas of physical facilities, and use of community and school resources did not have any proposals ranked amongst the lowest eleven, whereas the task area of system planning and management had four. Included in this latter task area were the proposals (38, 39, 44, 45) that (1) excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes,

(2) conventional units of school organization; that is, Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High, should be phased out, (3) opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided, and (4) organizational structures within the school should be less hierarchical in nature than they are at present. These four proposals ranked 50, 40.5, 49, and 43.5 respectively, and had means ranging from 2.85 to 3.09.

Thus, the task area of school-community relations had three proposals ranked amongst the lowest eleven proposals in the category of significance; the task area of system planning and management had four; the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and staff personnel had two each; and the task areas of physical facilities, and use of community and school resources each had no proposals included amongst the lowest ranking.

Highest Ranked Proposals on Ease of Implementation

In Table 13 the overall ranking of the fifty proposals pertaining to the category of ease of implementation is shown. As indicated in this table, the task area of school-community relations had two proposals (2, 9) included amongst the highest ten proposals in the rank order. These proposals ranked 1 and 3.5 respectively, and had means of 3.62 and 3.38. They stated that records of decision-making within the school system, such as budget allocations, should be made accessible to the public, and that school councils should communicate community-school needs and concerns to school boards. Also shown in Table 13, is that the task area of curriculum

Table 13

Means and Ranks of All Proposals, in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Based on Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Task Area and Proposal Number*	Mean	Rank
School-Community Relations		
1.	2.19	47
2.	3.62	1
3.	2.84	22.5
4.	2.28	46
5.	2.39	42
6.	2.78	26.5
7.	2.12	48
8.	3.03	12
9.	3.38	3.5
10.	2.96	15
Curriculum and Instruction		
11.	2.65	37
12.	2.74	29
13.	2.34	43
14.	2.73	31
15.	2.96	15
16.	2.64	38
17.	3.52	2
18.	2.92	19
19.	2.84	22.5
20.	3.38	3.5
Use of Community and School Resources		
21.	2.73	31
22.	2.92	19
23.	2.95	17
24.	2.68	35.5
25.	3.05	11
Staff Personnel		
26.	2.78	26.5
27.	2.58	39.5
28.	2.79	25
29.	1.74	49
30.	1.48	50

Table 13 (continued)

Task Area and Proposal Number	Mean	Rank	Task Area and Proposal Number	Mean	Rank
31.	2.68	35.5	41.	2.92	19
32.	3.06	10	42.	2.71	34
33.	2.85	21	43.	2.73	31
34.	3.33	5	44.	2.29	45
35.	3.27	6	45.	2.77	28
System Planning and Management			Physical Facilities		
36.	3.00	13	46.	2.49	41
37.	2.72	33	47.	2.96	15
38.	2.82	24	48.	3.08	9
39.	2.58	39.5	49.	3.24	7
40.	2.31	44	50.	3.22	8

*For the content of the proposals, refer to the previous tables or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

and instruction had two proposals amongst the top ten in the ranking, while the task area dealing with use of community and school resources had none. The two proposals (17, 20) in the former task area stated that greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies, and that power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools. These proposals ranked 2 and 3.5 respectively, and had means of 3.52 and 3.38.

The task area of staff personnel had three proposals (32, 34, 35) amongst the top ranking. These proposals stated that (1) counselling services available to teachers-in-training should be improved and increased to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers, (2) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy, and (3) special professional personnel, such as speech therapists and psychologists, should not be required to have teaching certificates. The rank orders of these three proposals were 10, 5, and 6 respectively, and the means were 3.06, 3.33, and 3.27.

Table 13 further indicates that the task area of system planning and management had no proposals included amongst the top ten on ease of implementation, while the task area relating to physical facilities had three. These proposals (48, 49, 50) were those which stated that (1) certain schools should be designed as area schools offering services to neighbouring schools, (2) buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community, and (3) greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings. The means for these proposals ranged from 3.08 to 3.24, and they

ranked 9, 7, and 8 respectively.

Therefore, the task areas of school-community relations, and curriculum and instruction each had two proposals included amongst the highest ten proposals in the overall ranking on ease of implementation; the task areas of staff personnel, and physical facilities each had three; and the task areas of system planning and management, and use of community and school resources had none.

Lowest Ranked Proposals on Ease of Implementation

Table 13 shows that the task area of school-community relations had four proposals (1, 4, 5, 7) ranked amongst the lowest ten proposals in the overall ranking on ease of implementation. These proposals stated that (1) citizens should be involved to a greater extent in setting goals for schools, (2) school councils should have the power to establish important policy decisions regarding the programme of studies, (3) school councils should determine budget priorities, and (4) school councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved. The means for these four proposals were 2.19, 2.28, 2.39, and 2.12 respectively, and they ranked 47, 46, 42, and 48. Also indicated in Table 13, is that the task area of curriculum and instruction had one proposal (13) ranked amongst the lowest ten proposals. This proposal had a rank order of 43 and a mean of 2.34. It stated that teaching methods should be individual-centred.

Included in each of the task areas of staff personnel, and system planning and management were two proposals amongst the lowest

ranking. In the former task area, the proposals (29, 30) stated that teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community, and that teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results. These two proposals ranked 49 and 50 respectively, and had means of 1.74 and 1.48. Further, the proposals (40, 44) that reorganization of the school year should be based on continuous learning year cycling plans whereby there are a number of short term learning periods interspersed by brief vacations, and that opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided, were those included in the latter task area of system planning and management. The rank orders of these proposals were 44 and 45 respectively, and they had means of 2.31 and 2.29.

Also shown in Table 13, is that the task area dealing with use of community and school resources had no proposals amongst the lowest ten in the overall ranking. The task area of physical facilities, however, had one. This proposal (46) had a rank order of 41 and a mean of 2.49. It stated that design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary.

In sum, the task area of school-community relations had four proposals amongst the lowest ten ranks in the overall ranking of the fifty proposals on ease of implementation. Further, the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and physical facilities each had one proposal included in the lowest ranking; the task areas of staff personnel, and system planning and management each had two; and the

task area relating to use of community and school resources had none.

RELATIONSHIP AMONG AGREEMENT, SIGNIFICANCE, AND EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION

This section presents the relationship amongst the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation for each of the six task areas. This relationship, as indicated by Kendall's coefficient of concordance, was investigated to measure the extent of association among the three sets of ranks that were determined on the basis of the principals' responses. Reference is made to the task areas with the highest and those with the lowest degree of concordance amongst the three sets of ranks pertaining to agreement, significance, and ease of implementation.

Table 14 indicates that the highest relationship amongst agreement, significance, and ease of implementation were in the task areas of staff personnel, and school-community relations. These two task areas had coefficients of concordance of .79 and .76 respectively. Also, these coefficients were found to be significant at the .05 level when the chi square test was applied.

The relatively high coefficients of concordance in these task areas indicate that the proposals within the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation ranked in a similar order. Further, by being significant at the .05 level, some assurance was provided that the concordance in ranking among the three areas was higher than it would be by chance. This, however, was not the case with the other four task areas. The coefficients of concordance were

Table 14

Relationship amongst Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation for the Total Sample of Principals, for Each Task Area

Task Area	W*
1. School-Community Relations	.76**
2. Curriculum and Instruction	.60
3. Use of Community and School Resources	.44
4. Staff Personnel	.79**
5. System Planning and Management	.51
6. Physical Facilities	.56

*W stands for Kendall's coefficient of concordance.

**These coefficients were significant at the .05 level.

lower than they were in the task areas of staff personnel and school-community relations, and they were not significant at the .05 level.

As indicated in Table 14, the lowest degree of concordance on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation was in the task areas referring to use of community and school resources, and system planning and management. This indicates that the rank orders of proposals within the three categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation were not similar.

SUMMARY

This chapter focussed on the research findings for the total sample of principals. The description dealt with (1) the extent to which principals in the Province of Alberta agreed with various proposals put forth in A Choice of Futures, (2) the degree to which they perceived the proposals to be significant for change, and (3) the extent to which they perceived the proposals to be feasible to implement. First, the presentation considered the findings pertinent to each of the six task areas; then, it centred on the overall findings of the fifty proposals. Finally, the relationship amongst the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation was examined for each task area.

The findings indicated that some proposals ranked amongst the extreme ends of the rank order in the task areas, in addition to being included amongst the top or bottom proposals in the overall ranking. Three proposals that ranked amongst the highest on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation in the task areas

of curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, and physical facilities respectively were those which stated that (1) greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies, (2) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy, and (3) buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community. These proposals also ranked amongst the highest in the overall ranking.

Four proposals that ranked amongst the lowest on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation in the task areas of school-community relations, staff personnel, and system planning and management stated that (1) school councils should determine budget priorities, (2) teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community, (3) teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results, and (4) opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided. These four proposals also ranked amongst the lowest in the overall ranking.

The task areas of curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, and physical facilities had the largest proportional representation of proposals included amongst the highest overall ranking in the categories of agreement, significance, or ease of implementation, while the task areas of system planning and management, and use of community and school resources had the lowest proportion. Also, the highest relationship amongst agreement, significance, and ease of implementation was evident in the task areas of staff personnel and

school-community relations, while the lowest was present in the task areas dealing with use of community and school resources, and system planning and management.

A generalization which may be derived from the ranking is that although principals expressed greatest agreement with some proposals in various categories and perceived them to be most significant, they indicated some reservations regarding the feasibility of implementing them.

Chapter 5

ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR THE VARIOUS SUBGROUPS OF PRINCIPALS

This chapter attempts to answer the question: Were there differences of opinion amongst principals of various subgroups in regard to agreement, significance, and ease of implementation of the proposals within each of the six task areas? These subgroups were derived on the basis of various school characteristics and various personal and professional characteristics of principals. Included amongst the subgroups of various school characteristics were those principals categorized on the basis of (1) grade organization, (2) size of school, (3) school types, and (4) urban and rural localities. Those categorized on the basis of age, years of teacher education, amount of graduate training, and years of experience as a principal were included in the subgroups relating to the characteristics of principals.

The findings for the various subgroups of principals based on school characteristics are presented first; then the discussion focusses on the research findings that are relevant to subgroups based on personal and professional characteristics of principals. Finally, on the basis of this discussion, some conclusions are drawn regarding the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation.

SUBGROUPS BASED ON SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

This section describes the findings for subgroups of principals based on (1) grade organization, (2) size of school, (3) school types, and (4) urban and rural localities. The presentation deals with the extent of concordance amongst principals of various subgroups on each of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was the criterion used for the purposes of establishing the extent to which these subgroups differed. If the coefficient of concordance indicated a value below .70 for a particular task area in the category of agreement, significance, or ease of implementation, a closer observation of the ranking of proposals within that task area was made.

The ranks have been calculated on the basis of the responses provided by the various subgroups of principals. A rank of one, for instance, indicates that the proposal had a mean that was highest of all the means of the various proposals within a particular task area. Thus, a rank of one indicates a greater degree of agreement, significance, or feasibility for implementing a particular proposal than does a rank of five.

Grade Organization

This portion of the chapter deals with the findings for subgroups of principals based on grade organization. The grade levels being administered by these principals include (1) Elementary, (2) Elementary-Junior High, (3) Elementary-Junior-Senior High,

(4) Junior High, (5) Junior-Senior High, and (6) Senior High.

Agreement. Table 15 indicates that there was a relatively high degree of concordance in the category of agreement, amongst principals of various grade organizations. The highest degree of concordance was present in the task area of staff personnel, while the lowest was evident in the task area dealing with use of community and school resources. The coefficients of concordance for these two task areas were .96 and .68 respectively.

Table 16 shows that the proposal (22), volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized, elicited a greater degree of agreement from the Elementary, Elementary-Junior High, and Elementary-Junior-Senior High school principals than it did from the Junior High, Junior-Senior High, and Senior High school principals. Also, the proposal (24) that school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems, evoked a lesser degree of agreement from Elementary, Elementary-Junior High, and Elementary-Junior-Senior High school principals than it did from Junior High, Junior-Senior High, and Senior High school principals.

Significance. Table 15 also indicates that the lowest degree of concordance amongst subgroups of principals in the category of significance was found in those task areas referring to use of community and school resources, and physical facilities. These two task areas had coefficients of concordance of .49 and .64

Table 15

Extent of Concordance amongst Principals from Various Grade Organizations on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W**					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.
Agreement	.85	.84	.68	.96	.95	.84
Significance	.80	.85	.49	.83	.89	.64
Implementation	.89	.76	.44	.85	.70	.70

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**All values of W were significant at the .05 level.

Table 16

Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Agreement, Pertaining to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations

Proposal Number*	Elementary	Elementary-Junior High	Elementary-Junior-Senior High	Junior High	Junior-Senior High	Senior High
21.	1	1	1	1	1	1
22.	2	2	2	4	4	5
23.	3	3	3	2.5	2.5	3.5
24.	5	4	4	2.5	2.5	2
25.	4	5	5	5	5	3.5

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to Table 7 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

respectively. The remaining four task areas, however, indicated a relatively high degree of concordance amongst subgroups whereby coefficients of .80 or higher were observed. The highest coefficient of .89, however, was present in the task area of system planning and management.

Table 17 shows that the proposal (21), work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided, was perceived to be the most significant one in the task area dealing with use of community and school resources, by all subgroups of principals with the exception of the Junior High school principals. Also, the proposal (22) that volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized, was perceived to be more significant by Elementary, Elementary-Junior High, Elementary-Junior-Senior High, and Junior High school principals than it was by Junior-Senior High and Senior High school principals.

Further indicated in Table 17, is that the Junior High school principals perceived the proposal (23), differentiated staffing should include community resource people, to be the most significant one in the task area relating to use of community and school resources. Other subgroups of principals, however, perceived this proposal to be significant to a lesser degree than did the Junior High subgroup. Moreover, the proposal (24) that school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems, was perceived to be of greater significance by the Senior High school principals than it was by the other four

Table 17

Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Significance, Relating to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations

Proposal Number*	Elementary	Elementary-Junior High	Elementary-Junior-Senior High	Junior High	Junior-Senior High	Senior High
21.	1	1	1	3	1	1
22.	2	2	3	2	5	5
23.	3	3	2	1	3	3.5
24.	5	5	4	5	4	2
25.	4	4	5	4	2	3.5

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to Table 7 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

subgroups. Likewise, the Junior-Senior High school principals perceived the proposal (25) which stated that present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished, to be of greater significance than did the other subgroups of principals.

In Table 18, which refers to the task area of physical facilities, it is shown that the Junior-Senior High school principals perceived the proposals (46, 47) that design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary, and that school design decisions should be made at the local level, to be of greater significance than did the other subgroups. This subgroup also perceived the proposal (49), buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community, to be of less significance than did the other principals.

Table 18 further indicates that Elementary-Junior High, Junior High, and Senior High school principals perceived the proposal (48) that certain schools should be designed as area schools offering services to neighbouring schools, to be more significant than did the remaining three subgroups of principals. Moreover, the Elementary-Junior-Senior High school principals perceived the proposal (50) that greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings, to be more significant than did the other principals. This proposal had a rank order of 5 for all the subgroups of principals, with the exception of the Elementary-Junior-Senior High subgroup where it had a rank order of 2.

Ease of implementation. As shown in Table 15, the category of

Table 18

Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Significance, Referring to Physical Facilities, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations

Proposal Number*	Elementary	Elementary-Junior High	Elementary-Junior-Senior High	Junior High	Junior-Senior High	Senior High
46.	1.5	2	3	2	1	3
47.	3	4	4	4	2	3
48.	4	3	5	3	4	3
49.	1.5	1	1	1	3	1
50.	5	5	2	5	5	5

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to Table 10 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

case of implementation had a coefficient of concordance above .70 in all the task areas with the exception of the one referring to use of community and school resources. This task area had a coefficient of .44, which was considerably below the highest coefficient of .89 found to be present in the task area of school-community relations.

Table 19 indicates that in the task area relating to use of community and school resources, principals administering Junior-Senior High schools perceived to be more feasible to implement the proposal (21) that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided, than did principals administering schools of other grade levels. This proposal had a rank order of 1 for the Junior-Senior High subgroup and a rank order of 3 or less for the other five subgroups. Also, the Elementary school principals perceived to be more feasible to implement the proposal (22) that volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized, than did the other subgroups. As shown in Table 19, this proposal had a rank order of 1 for the Elementary principals.

The Senior High school principals perceived to be less feasible to implement the proposal (23) that differentiated staffing should include community resource people, than did the other principals, and perceived to be more feasible to implement the proposal (24) that school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems. The Elementary school principals, on the other hand, perceived to be less feasible to implement the proposal (25), present attendance boundaries

Table 19

Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Pertaining to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals from Various Grade Organizations

Proposal Number*	Elementary	Elementary-Junior High	Elementary-Junior-Senior High	Junior High	Junior-Senior High	Senior High
21.	4	5	4	4	1	3
22.	1	3	3	2	3.5	4
23.	2	2	2	3	3.5	5
24.	5	4	5	5	5	2
25.	3	1	1	1	2	1

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to Table 7 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

within administrative units should be abolished, than did the other five subgroups of principals.

Size of School

This section of the chapter presents the findings for subgroups of principals which were derived on the basis of school size. Included in these subgroups are principals administering schools with a staff of (1) nine or less teachers, (2) ten to nineteen teachers, and (3) twenty or more teachers.

Agreement. Table 20 indicates that the degree of concordance amongst principals of various school sizes was high in the category pertaining to agreement. The lowest coefficients of concordance were in the task areas of school-community relations, and curriculum and instruction. These task areas, however, had coefficients of .97. The highest coefficients of concordance were found in the task areas relating to use of community and school resources, and physical facilities; these task areas had coefficients of .99.

The high coefficients of concordance, which were also found to be significant at the .05 level, indicated that there was almost complete agreement amongst the various subgroups of principals based on school size in their responses to the proposals in the questionnaire. Thus, when the proposals were ranked during the analysis of the data, the rank order in the category of agreement was almost the same for each of the three subgroups of principals.

Significance. Also indicated in Table 20, was the high

Table 20

Extent of Concordance amongst Principals of Various School Sizes on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W**					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.
Agreement	.97	.97	.99	.98	.98	.99
Significance	.87	.95	.91	.94	.97	.96
Implementation	.97	.93	.84	.94	.91	.80

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**All values of W were significant at the .05 level.

degree of concordance amongst principals of various school sizes in the category of significance. The lowest coefficient of concordance was present in the task area of school-community relations while the highest was evident in the task area of system planning and management. These two task areas had coefficients of .87 and .97 respectively.

Ease of implementation. As was the case in the categories of agreement and significance, there also was a high degree of concordance amongst principals on ease of implementation. The highest extent of concordance was in the task area dealing with school-community relations; this task area had a coefficient of .97. The lowest degree of concordance, as shown in Table 20, was evident in the task area of physical facilities; this task area had a coefficient of .80.

School Types

In this section of the chapter, the findings for subgroups of principals based on school types are described. The types of schools being administered by these subgroups of principals are (1) city public and separate, and (2) division or county.

Agreement. Table 21 indicates that the extent of concordance between the two subgroups of principals of different school types was high in the category of agreement. Complete agreement, as indicated by coefficients of 1.00, was evident in the task areas pertaining to use of community and school resources, and staff personnel. The

Table 21

Extent of Concordance between Principals of Different School Types on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.**	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.**
Agreement	.99	.97	1.00	1.00	.97	.95
Significance	.97	.95	.99	.92***	.94	.94
Implementation	.99	.90***	.95	.93***	.96	.85

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**The significance levels for these task areas could not be obtained.

***These values of W were not significant at the .05 level.

lowest degree of concordance, as indicated by a coefficient of .95, was present in the task area of physical facilities.

Significance. Table 21 also shows that the extent of concordance between the two subgroups of principals was high on significance. As indicated by coefficients of .92 and .99 respectively, the lowest degree of concordance was in the task area of staff personnel while the highest was in the task area referring to use of community and school resources.

Ease of implementation. There was a high degree of concordance between subgroups of principals of different school types in regard to the ease of implementing the various proposals. The lowest extent of concordance was evident in the task area of physical facilities, whereas the highest was present in the task area dealing with school-community relations. As indicated in Table 21, the coefficients for these two task areas were .85 and .99 respectively.

Urban and Rural Localities

This portion of the chapter describes the findings pertinent to subgroups of principals administering schools in urban and rural localities. The subgroups include principals of schools located in (1) urban centres with populations greater than 100,000, (2) urban centres with populations ranging from 1,000 to 100,000, and (3) rural centres with populations below 1,000.

Agreement. Table 22 shows that the extent of concordance amongst principals from urban and rural localities was high. The

Table 22

Extent of Concordance amongst Principals from Urban and Rural Areas on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.
Agreement	.99	.97	.91	.99	.99	.96
Significance	.89	.93	.96	.95	.96	.91
Implementation	.94	.88	.76**	.92	.88	.78**

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**These values of W were not significant at the .05 level.

lowest degree of concordance, as indicated by a coefficient of .91, was present in the task area pertaining to use of community and school resources, while three task areas displayed the highest degree of concordance. These were the task areas of school-community relations, staff personnel, and system planning and management. Each of these task areas had a coefficient of .99, thus indicating almost complete agreement amongst the various subgroups of principals based on urban and rural localities.

Significance. As was the case in the category of agreement, principals also indicated a high degree of concordance in the category referring to significance. The lowest extent of concordance was indicated in the task area of school-community relations; this task area had a coefficient of .89. Table 22 shows that the two task areas dealing with use of community and school resources, and system planning and management had the highest coefficient of .96.

Ease of implementation. Table 22 further indicates that the degree of concordance on ease of implementation amongst principals from urban and rural localities, was generally somewhat lower than in the previously mentioned categories. The task areas relating to use of community and school resources, and physical facilities indicated the least concordance; these task areas had coefficients of .76 and .78 respectively. Also, the task area of school-community relations indicated the highest degree of concordance amongst the subgroups of principals based on urban and rural localities. The coefficient, in this case, had a value of .94.

SUBGROUPS BASED ON PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRINCIPALS

This section presents the research findings for subgroups of principals based on (1) age, (2) years of teacher education, (3) amount of graduate training, and (4) years of experience as a principal. As was the case in the previous section, the description deals with the degree of concordance amongst principals of various subgroups on each of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation for each of the task areas. For the purposes of determining the extent to which the subgroups differed, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used. Where the coefficient was below .70 in any of the categories pertaining to agreement, significance, and ease of implementation, a closer observation of the ranking of proposals was made.

Age

This part of the chapter discusses the findings for subgroups of principals that were determined on the basis of age. The school principals who are included in these subgroups are those of (1) thirty-five years of age or less, (2) thirty-six to fifty years of age, and (3) fifty-one or more years of age.

Agreement. Table 23 shows that there was a high degree of concordance in the category of agreement, amongst principals of various age subgroups. The lowest degree of concordance was evident in the task area relating to use of community and school resources; this task area had a coefficient of .82. Also, the two task areas of

Table 23

Extent of Concordance amongst Principals of Various Age Categories on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W**					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.
Agreement	.98	.98	.82	.92	.95	.96
Significance	.90	.96	.91	.91	.92	.96
Implementation	.97	.81	.80	.89	.89	.80

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**All values of W were at the .05 level of significance.

school-community relations, and curriculum and instruction had coefficients of .98. This indicates that there was almost complete agreement amongst principals of various age subgroups, in the responses made to the proposals of the questionnaire relating to these task areas.

Significance. Table 23 further indicates that the extent of concordance was high in the category of significance, amongst principals of various age subgroups. All the coefficients of concordance were .90 or higher; the lowest was in the task area of school-community relations, and the highest in the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and physical facilities. Each of these two latter task areas had a coefficient of .96.

Ease of implementation. The extent of concordance amongst subgroups of principals based on age, was somewhat lower in the category of ease of implementation than in the two previously discussed categories. All but one coefficient of concordance were in the range of .80 to .89. The lowest coefficients were observed to be present in the task areas pertaining to use of community and school resources, and physical facilities. These two task areas had coefficients of .80. The highest degree of concordance, with a coefficient of .97, was evident in the task area of school-community relations.

Years of Teacher Education

The description in this section of the chapter deals with the

findings relating to subgroups of principals assembled on the basis of teacher education. Included in these are principals with (1) 4.9 years or less of teacher education, (2) 5-5.9 years of teacher education, and (3) 6 or more years of teacher education.

Agreement. There was a high degree of concordance in the category of agreement, amongst principals with various number of years of teacher education. As shown in Table 24, complete agreement amongst these subgroups of principals was present in the task areas of school-community relations, and physical facilities. The least concordance amongst the principals was evident in the task area dealing with use of community and school resources. Unlike the previous two task areas, which had coefficients of 1.00, this task area had a coefficient of .89.

Significance. Table 24 also shows that the degree of concordance amongst principals was high on significance. The coefficients of concordance ranged from .91 to .97, with the lowest being in the task area of school-community relations, and the highest in the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and system planning and management.

Ease of implementation. In the category pertaining to ease of implementation, the highest degree of concordance amongst principals was in the task area dealing with curriculum and instruction; this task area had a coefficient of concordance of .94. However, as indicated in Table 24, the lowest extent of concordance

Table 24

Extent of Concordance amongst Principals of Various Number of Years of Teacher Education on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.
Agreement	1.00	.99	.89	.96	.97	1.00
Significance	.91	.97	.96	.96	.97	.96
Implementation	.93	.94	.42**	.84	.84	.89

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**This value of W was not significant at the .05 level.

was evident in the task area relating to use of community and school resources, where a coefficient of .42 was observed.

Table 25 shows that the proposal (21), work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided, was perceived to be more feasible to implement by principals with six or more years of teacher education than it was by those with less than six years of teacher education. Also, the proposal (25) that present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished, was perceived to be more feasible to implement by principals with less than six years of teacher education than it was by those having six or more years of teacher education.

Further, the proposal (23), differentiated staffing should include community resource people, was perceived to be less feasible to implement by principals with 5-5.9 years of teacher education than it was by the other two subgroups of principals. This proposal ranked 3 for the former subgroup, and 1 for the latter two subgroups.

Amount of Graduate Training

This section of the chapter presents the findings for subgroups of principals based on amount of graduate training in Educational Administration. Included in these subgroups are principals with (1) no graduate training, (2) some graduate training, and (3) graduate training equivalent to a diploma or more.

Agreement. The degree of concordance was high in the category of agreement, amongst principals experiencing various amounts of graduate training. Table 26 shows that all the

Table 25

Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Relating to Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Principals with Various Number of Years of Teacher Education

Proposal Number*	4.9 Years or Less	5-5.9 Years	6 Years or More
21.	4	5	2
22.	3	2	3
23.	1	3	1
24.	5	4	4
25.	2	1	5

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to Table 7 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

Table 26.

Extent of Concordance amongst Principals, Experiencing Various Amounts of Graduate Training, on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W**					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.
Agreement	.93	.97	.96	.96	.98	1.00
Significance	.93	.95	.96	.96	.97	.96
Implementation	.99	.90	.84	.96	.87	.96

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**All values of W were at the .05 level of significance.

coefficients of concordance were .93 or higher. The lowest value of .93 was present in the task area of school-community relations, while the highest value of 1.00 was observed in the task area of physical facilities.

Significance. Table 26 also indicates that the degree of concordance amongst subgroups of principals determined on the basis of the amount of graduate training they experienced, was high in the category of significance. The highest degree of concordance in this category was evident in the task area of system planning and management, while the lowest was observed in the task area of school-community relations. The coefficients of concordance for these two task areas were .97 and .93 respectively.

Ease of implementation. The degree of concordance amongst principals having a varying number of years of graduate training, was also high on ease of implementation. This is indicated in Table 26, where the lowest coefficient of concordance was .84 in the task area dealing with use of community and school resources, and the highest was .99 in the task area of school-community relations.

Years of Experience As a Principal

This portion of the chapter describes the findings for subgroups of principals that were derived on the basis of years of experience as a principal. The subgroups include principals having (1) two or less years of experience, (2) three to five years of experience, (3) six to ten years of experience, and (4) eleven or

more years of experience as a principal.

Agreement. Table 27 indicates that the degree of concordance amongst principals with differing number of years as a principal was high in the category of agreement. The lowest coefficient of concordance of .91 was observed in the task areas of school-community relations, curriculum and instruction, and use of community and school resources; the highest coefficient of .98 was present in the task area of staff personnel.

Significance. As shown in Table 27, the degree of concordance was also high in the category of significance amongst subgroups determined on the basis of years of experience as a principal. The highest coefficients of concordance were present in the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and staff personnel; these task areas had coefficients of .94. The lowest coefficient of concordance, with a value of .89, was observed in the task area of school-community relations.

Ease of implementation. The highest degree of concordance amongst subgroups on ease of implementation is indicated in Table 27 by a coefficient of .96 in the task area of school-community relations. On the other hand, the lowest extent of concordance was observed in the task areas pertaining to use of community and school resources, and system planning and management. The coefficients for these task areas were .68 and .65 respectively.

Table 28 shows that in the task area dealing with use of

Table 27

Extent of Concordance amongst Administrators of Various Number of Years as Principal on Agreement, Significance, and Ease of Implementation, for Each Task Area

Category	Task Area* and Its Respective W**					
	Sch. Comm. Rel.	Curr. Inst.	Comm. Sch. Res.	Staff Pers.	Syst. Plan. Mgt.	Phys. Fac.
Agreement	.91	.91	.91	.98	.96	.96
Significance	.89	.94	.91	.94	.93	.90
Implementation	.96	.85	.68	.92	.65	.87

*For the complete wording of each of the abbreviated task areas, refer to Table 14 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

**All values of W were significant at the .05 level.

Table 28

Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Dealing with Use of Community and School Resources, Based on Responses of Administrators with Various Number of Years of Experience as Principal

Proposal Number*	2 Years or Less	3-5 Years	6-10 Years	11 or More Years
21.	3	4	5	5
22.	2	2	4	4
23.	1	3	2	3
24.	5	5	3	1
25.	4	1	1	2

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to Table 7 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

community and school resources, the subgroup of principals with two or less years of experience in their positions perceived the proposals (21, 23) that work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided, and that differentiated staffing should include community resource people, to be more feasible to implement than did the other subgroups. This subgroup also perceived to be less feasible to implement the proposal (25) which stated that present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished, than did the other subgroups.

Also indicated in Table 28 is that those with five or less years of experience as a principal perceived to be more feasible to implement the proposal (22), volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized, than did those with more than five years of experience. In addition, the subgroup of principals with eleven or more years of experience perceived to be more feasible to implement the proposal (24) that school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems, than did the other subgroups. This proposal had a rank order of 1 for this subgroup having eleven or more years of experience as a principal, and a rank order of 5 for the subgroups with two or less years of experience, and three to five years of experience.

Table 29 indicates that in the task area of system planning and management, the subgroup of principals with eleven or more years of experience in their position perceived to be less feasible to

Table 29

Ranks of Proposals in the Category of Ease of Implementation, in the System Planning and Management Task Area, Based on Responses of Administrators with Various Number of Years of Experience as Principal

Proposal Number*	2 Years or Less	3-5 Years	6-10 Years	11 or More Years
36.	2	1	1	9
37.	4	8	5	7
38.	3	3	7	10
39.	8	6.5	8	6
40.	10	9	9	3
41.	1	2	4	8
42.	6	6.5	3	1
43.	7	5	2	4
44.	9	10	10	5
45.	5	4	6	2

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to Table 9 or to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

implement, than did the other subgroups, the proposals (36, 38, 41) which stated that (1) planning should be carried out in accordance with the principle of efficiency, (2) excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes, and (3) special attention should be given to costing in the design and evaluation of programmes. These three proposals each had a rank order that was generally much lower for the subgroup with eleven years of experience than it was for the remaining subgroups of principals. Also, this subgroup of principals perceived to be more feasible to implement, than did the other subgroups, the proposals (40, 42, 44, 45) that (1) reorganization of the school year should be based on continuous learning year cycling plans whereby there are a number of short term learning periods interspersed by brief vacations, (2) educational planning should be correlated with general social and economic planning, (3) opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided, and (4) organizational structures within the school should be less hierarchical in nature than they are at present. The rank orders of these proposals were generally considerably higher for this subgroup than they were for the other three subgroups.

Further indicated in Table 29 is that the subgroup of principals with two or less years of experience in their positions perceived the proposal (37), school budget time-frame should be lengthened from one year to three years for operating and five years for capital budgets, to be more feasible to implement than did the other subgroups. In a similar manner, the subgroup of principals

with six to ten years of experience perceived the proposal (43) that expenditures should be related more directly to the objectives that programmes purport to achieve, to be more feasible to implement than did the other subgroups.

CONCLUSIONS PERTAINING TO AGREEMENT, SIGNIFICANCE, AND EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION

From the foregoing analysis, the following conclusions seem evident:

1. Differences of opinion with regard to the proposals for change, in the categories pertaining to extent of agreement, significance, or ease of implementation, existed amongst subgroups of principals composed on the basis of grade organization. These differences were most evident in the task areas relating to use of community and school resources, and physical facilities.

2. Small differences of opinion with regard to proposals for change, in the categories pertaining to the extent of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation, seemed evident amongst subgroups of principals formed on the basis of school size, school types, and urban and rural localities.

3. Some differences of opinion with regard to several proposals for change, in the category of ease of implementation, appeared to exist amongst subgroups of principals that were derived on the basis of years of teacher education.

4. Small differences of opinion with regard to proposals for change, in the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of

implementation, were evident amongst subgroups of principals composed on the basis of age and the amount of graduate training.

5. Differences of opinion with regard to the proposals for change, in the category referring to ease of implementation, existed amongst subgroups of principals that were derived on the basis of the number of years of experience as a principal. These differences were most evident in the task areas pertaining to use of community and school resources, and system planning and management.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the results that were obtained from an analysis of data for various subgroups of principals. The subgroups were derived on the basis of various school, and personal and professional characteristics of principals. Included amongst the subgroups were those derived on the basis of (1) grade organization, (2) size of school, (3) school types, (4) urban and rural localities, (5) age, (6) years of teacher education, (7) amount of graduate training, and (8) years of experience as a principal.

For the purposes of establishing the extent to which various subgroups differed in the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation for the six task areas, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used. Where the coefficient on agreement, significance, or ease of implementation for a particular task area was below .70, an observation of the ranking of the items within the task area was made.

The findings indicated that differences of opinion were most

evident amongst subgroups of principals derived on the basis of grade organization, years of teacher education, and years of experience as a principal. The task areas that showed the lowest degree of concordance amongst subgroups of principals, generally in the category of ease of implementation, were those pertaining to use of community and school resources, system planning and management, and physical facilities.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents an overview of the study. First, a summary of the research problem and design are presented. Second, the findings of the study are summarized. Third, conclusions based on the findings are drawn, and implications of the results for practice are discussed. Finally, suggestions are made for further research.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH PROBLEM AND DESIGN

The Problem

The problem under investigation in this study was to examine the opinions of school principals in the Province of Alberta with respect to the implementation of some proposals on school organization and operation as outlined by Worth in his Report, A Choice of Futures. An attempt was made to examine (1) the extent to which principals in the province agreed with the proposals for change, (2) the extent of agreement regarding the significance of the proposals for educational change, and (3) the feasibility of implementing the proposals for change.

An attempt was also made to investigate if there were differences of opinions with regard to agreement, significance, and ease of implementation of the proposals, amongst subgroups of

principals that were derived on the basis of various school, and personal and professional characteristics. The characteristics, on the basis of which the subgroups were formed, included (1) grade organization, (2) size of school, (3) school types, (4) urban and rural localities, (5) age, (6) years of teacher education, (7) amount of graduate training, and (8) years of experience as a principal.

The Instrument

The instrument used for this study was a questionnaire that was designed by the researcher. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of fifty proposals that were either explicitly stated or implied in the Worth Report, while the second part dealt with school characteristics, and the respondents' personal and professional characteristics. The first portion of the questionnaire was divided into six task areas; four of these contained ten proposals, while the remaining two contained five each. Included in the task areas were (1) school-community relations, (2) curriculum and instruction, (3) use of community and school resources, (4) staff personnel, (5) system planning and management, and (6) physical facilities.

In the first part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate (1) the extent to which they agreed with the proposals for change, (2) the degree to which they perceived the proposals to be significant for change, and (3) the extent to which they perceived implementation of the proposals to be feasible. The respondents reacted to the proposals by circling letters and numbers on five-point scales. Likewise, in the second part of the

questionnaire, respondents provided their answers by placing a check mark in the space provided.

The Sample

A stratified random sample of 450 principals in the Province of Alberta was selected for the purposes of this study. Proportionately included in the sample were principals of six different grade organizations; namely, (1) Elementary, (2) Elementary-Junior High, (3) Elementary-Junior-Senior High, (4) Junior High, (5) Junior-Senior High, and (6) Senior High.

Collection of Data

A copy of the questionnaire was mailed to each of (1) one hundred seventy-five Elementary school principals, (2) one hundred forty-nine Elementary-Junior High school principals, (3) forty-five Elementary-Junior-Senior High school principals, (4) twenty-seven Junior High school principals, (5) twenty-seven Junior-Senior High school principals, and (6) twenty-seven Senior High school principals.

Analysis of Data

The letters of the encircled responses to the agreement and ease of implementation scales were first converted to numbers for the purposes of weighting; then, the numbers were transferred to computer cards. Means were calculated for each of the proposals within each task area, pertaining to the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation. On the basis of the means, the proposals were ranked for the total group of principals and for each of the

subgroups of principals. A rank of one assigned to a particular proposal, for example, indicated that it had a mean that was higher than any of the other means of proposals within a particular task area.

In order to determine the relationship amongst the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was applied. This statistical measure was also used to determine the degree of concordance amongst various subgroups of principals.

For the purposes of testing the significance of the observed values for the coefficient of concordance, a chi square test was applied.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

This section of the chapter presents a summary of the findings of the study. First, the proposals are presented that ranked amongst the extreme ends of the rank order on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation in the task areas, in addition to being included amongst the top or bottom proposals in the overall ranking. Second, the proposals are outlined that ranked amongst the extreme ends of the rank order on agreement and significance, but not on ease of implementation. Third, the proposals that ranked amongst the highest and those that ranked amongst the lowest on ease of implementation, but not on agreement and significance, are listed. Finally, the relationship among the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation for

the total group of principals is briefly stated, and a summary of the findings for the subgroups of principals is presented.

There were three proposals that ranked amongst the highest on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation in the task areas of curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, and physical facilities, in addition to being included amongst the top eleven proposals in the overall ranking of the fifty proposals. These proposals stated that (1) greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies, (2) staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy, and (3) buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community.

Six proposals that ranked amongst the lowest on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation in the task areas of school-community relations, staff personnel, and system planning and management stated that (1) school councils should determine budget priorities, (2) school councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved, (3) teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community, (4) teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results, (5) conventional units of school organization; that is, Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High, should be phased out, and (6) opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided. These six proposals also ranked amongst the lowest eleven proposals on agreement, significance, and ease of implementation in the overall ranking.

Some proposals ranked amongst the highest on agreement and significance, but not on ease of implementation. Five such proposals were present in the task areas of school-community relations, curriculum and instruction, use of community and school resources, staff personnel, and physical facilities respectively. These proposals were also included amongst the top eleven proposals in the overall ranking on agreement and significance. They stated that (1) schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities in their respective communities, (2) teaching methods should be individual-centred, (3) work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided, (4) schools should be staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs, and (5) design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary.

Two proposals ranked amongst the lowest on agreement and significance, but not on ease of implementation, in the task areas of curriculum and instruction, and system planning and management respectively. The proposals stated that students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is appropriate for their purposes, and that excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes. These proposals were also ranked amongst the lowest eleven proposals on agreement and significance, but not on ease of implementation, in the overall ranking.

There were five proposals ranked amongst the highest on ease

of implementation, but not on agreement and significance, in the task areas of school-community relations, curriculum and instruction, use of community and school resources, staff personnel, and physical facilities respectively. The proposals stated that (1) records of decision-making within the school system, such as budget allocations, should be made accessible to the public, (2) power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools, (3) present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished, (4) special professional personnel, such as speech therapists and psychologists, should not be required to have teaching certificates, and (5) greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings. These five proposals were also ranked amongst the eleven highest proposals on ease of implementation in the overall ranking of the fifty proposals.

Four proposals ranked amongst the lowest on ease of implementation, but not on agreement and significance, in the task areas of school-community relations, curriculum and instruction, system planning and management, and physical facilities respectively; these proposals also ranked amongst the lowest eleven on ease of implementation in the overall ranking. The proposals stated that (1) citizens should be involved to a greater extent in setting goals for schools, (2) teaching methods should be individual-centred, (3) reorganization of the school year should be based on continuous learning year cycling plans whereby there are a number of short term learning periods interspersed by brief vacations, and (4) design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement

of the physical plant when necessary.

The findings of this study also indicated that the highest degree of concordance amongst the categories of agreement, significance, and ease of implementation for the total group of principals was evident in the task areas of school-community relations, and staff personnel. The lowest degree of concordance, on the other hand, was observed in the task areas dealing with use of community and school resources, and system planning and management.

When the responses of various subgroups of principals were analysed, differences of opinion were most evident amongst subgroups formed on the basis of grade organization, years of teacher education, and years of experience as a principal. The task areas where the lowest degree of concordance was evident, generally in the category of ease of implementation, were those pertaining to use of community and school resources, system planning and management, and physical facilities. Some of the proposals within these three task areas, that evoked the greatest degree of differences in the responses of the subgroups, included those which stated that (1) work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided, (2) volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized, (3) school administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems, (4) present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished, (5) planning should be carried out in accordance with the principle of efficiency, (6) excessive manpower supply should be

a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes, (7) special attention should be given to costing in the design and evaluation of programmes, and (8) greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings.

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THE FINDINGS

The findings of this study would seem to warrant the following conclusions:

1. The grade levels being administered by principals appeared to be influential factors in evoking differences in perceptions in regard to some proposals for change.

2. School size did not appear to be an influential factor in the principals' reactions to the proposals from the Worth Report.

3. There appeared to be little evidence to suggest that the types of schools being administered by principals played an influential role in their responding to the proposals.

4. Administering schools in urban and rural localities did not appear to be major factors influencing differences in principals' perceptions of the proposals.

5. The age of principals administering schools in Alberta, did not appear to be a major factor in influencing differences in their perceptions regarding the proposals for change.

6. Amount of graduate training did not appear to be a major factor influencing differences in the principals' perceptions of the proposals.

7. Years of teacher education appeared to be a factor

influencing the principals' perceptions in regard to the feasibility of implementing some of the proposals for change.

8. Some evidence was provided that years of experience as a principal was an influential factor in the principals' perceptions regarding the feasibility of implementing some of the proposals in the Worth Report.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The findings of this study suggest a number of implications for principals, teachers, and school district administrators. If an attempt is made to implement some of the proposals put forth in the Worth Report, the traditional structures of organization at the school district, school, and classroom levels will have to be re-evaluated. Likewise, the traditional roles of principals, teachers, and school district administrators will need to be re-evaluated and redefined. Along with this re-evaluation, there will need to be a concerted effort made by all these professionals in planning for change so that the needs of students and the community are met.

The increased decentralization of the decision-making process that is implied in many of the proposals will make the principal's role more demanding than it was in the past. He will now have to provide leadership in the planning and organizing for change at the school he administers. This local initiative undertaken by the principal will have to be carried out in the context of greater responsiveness to parents, students, and teachers than was the case

in the past. However, the greater involvement of diverse groups will inevitably create conflicts in expectations for the educational process. The principal's role will be to apply various strategies for reconciling these conflicting expectations so that educational goals are not distorted during the process of operationalizing them. The onus will therefore be on him to resolve conflicts in such a manner that assurance is provided for group maintenance, which is necessary for goal accomplishment. This need for maintaining group cohesiveness may require that the principal possesses certain interpersonal skills that may be acquired by having a thorough understanding of various concepts in human relations and theories of social psychology. Thus, the basis of the principal's authority will shift from that of position to that of competence as a person.

Decisions made by the principal will affect the quality of education that is provided for a large number of students. Hence, his interpretive role of broad policies that are established by the provincial government and the school board will be of great importance. He will be held responsible for clarifying the aims of these policies for teachers, parents, and students, and devising means for implementing them. This implementation will require him to use his ingenuity in introducing structural changes at the school that will facilitate the accomplishment of the desired goals. In addition, he will have to provide leadership in a continuing diagnosis of the needs of students, teachers, and the community. Along with this needs assessment, the principal will have to provide leadership in assessing the extent to which the present practices are

meeting the needs and provide feasible alternatives for practice should the needs not be met. In order for him to successfully fulfill this role, however, he will have to be familiar with recent trends in education, possess technical competence for evaluation, and have a broad understanding of administrative theory.

The implementation of some of the proposals in the Report would challenge the principal to gain the attention and cooperation of all teachers as he goes about setting the norm-changing pattern in his school that will foster the achievement of the school's goals. This may mean that the principal, playing the crucial role of a change agent, will have to create a climate of innovativeness in his school whereby he encourages teachers to pursue better ways of helping students learn, stimulates enthusiasm amongst his staff for trying different approaches to teaching, and motivates his staff to work more closely with students in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of educational programmes. The principal will, however, have to ensure that facilities are available to the teachers and students so that this two-way interchange of ideas between staff and students is fostered. This may necessitate the introduction of certain changes in school organization so that better use of the available resources is made. The provisions made for the better utilization of resources will enable teachers to cope with problems that arise as they go about achieving the goals of the school. This, in turn, will foster the development of a climate at the school that is conducive to learning.

If some proposals were being implemented, the principal would

be called upon to play the role of coordinator to a greater extent than he did in the past. He would have to coordinate his planning efforts with those of other levels of government and local government agencies. In addition, he would be expected to provide some input into the policy development of other levels of government. This would require that he develop effective communication channels between his school and the central office of the school district so that the needs of the school are clearly articulated. If school councils were to be set up for these purposes, the onus would be on the principal to engage in an open dialogue between the school and the community. He would have to be willing to engage in greater collaboration in defining the needs that are to be voiced to the school board. This would seem to require that the principal be able to communicate effectively the school's needs to the school council. Further, it would be absolutely essential for the principal to display a willingness to accept criticism from parents, teachers, students, and the community in regard to the school's needs.

Greater articulation between the school and other community services would also have to be established if some of the proposals were to be implemented. This articulation would be necessary for the principal in order that he be able to carry out his planning function effectively, in terms of programme development, at the school.

One other implication for the school principal seems evident from the study. If staff orientations are to be consistent with the school's philosophy, the principal would be held responsible for clearly outlining this philosophy so that the misassignment of

teachers could be avoided. In addition, he would be called upon to more actively participate in the selection of personnel for his school. To facilitate this selection, the principal may find it necessary to maintain open communication channels with other schools in the system.

It is the teacher's responsibility, however, to translate the desired goals into learning experiences for students. In order that this be successfully done during the implementation of some proposals outlined in the Report, it may be necessary to re-evaluate and redefine the teacher's role. The implication for greater student autonomy, inherent in many of the Report's proposals, would seem to make such a re-evaluation essential.

The emphasis on participatory planning and learning in a number of the proposals suggests a change in the teacher's role from that of a director and controller of learning to that of a consultant and facilitator of the learning process. This implies a shift in teaching methods from those of lecturing and information giving to that of guiding through the process of inquiry. However, in order that this change in role be brought about successfully, it may be necessary for some teachers to participate in various in-service programmes that focus on new methods of teaching and curriculum design. In addition, it will be necessary for teachers to be knowledgeable in theories of human development, motivation, and group dynamics. The possession of this knowledge will aid the teacher in attaining the goals of personalized instruction.

The implementation of some of the proposals in the Report

will require that the teacher also becomes involved in the planning process at the school to a greater extent than he did in the past. This planning will have to be carried out in cooperation with the principal, students, and other members of the teaching staff. Although less time may be spent in prescribing programmes for students, more time will be spent in determining learning activities in consultation with the learner. Students and teachers will plan their learning activities together for the purposes of meeting the objectives of a particular learning situation. This increased learner involvement in the educational process will require a greater commitment on the teacher's part to the notion that students are self-directing individuals. Also, it will require that the teacher abandons the notion that his authority is based on position as has been the case in the past.

In his role as a facilitator of learning, the teacher will have to place a greater emphasis on the affective domain of learning. This will require that the teacher be skillful in creating a learning environment that is conducive to the development of interpersonal relations, in addition to developing the students' cognitive skills. This commitment to fostering human growth in the educational process will also make the teacher's role more demanding.

If some of the proposals are implemented, there will have to be greater cooperation and coordination of efforts amongst teachers. This interdisciplinary approach to teaching will be essential in helping the student coordinate his learning in a meaningful way. It will also be essential for the purposes of assessing the usefulness

of various teaching materials and for evaluating the extent to which the school's goals are being achieved.

As was the case with the principal and the teacher, the school district administrator's role will be more demanding than it was in the past. Should some of the proposals be implemented, the school district administrator will have to provide leadership in the school system's overall planning. He will be held accountable for the school system's performance, and will be called upon to see to it that the broad policies of the school board are successfully implemented at the schools. Thus, the success of implementing the proposals may depend, to a large extent, on the leadership tone that he sets within the district that he administers.

The onus will be on the school district administrator to set the climate for change at the system level. In providing this impetus for change, the superintendent will have to encourage principals to take risks in the implementation of certain proposals and provide them with incentives to do so. He will, however, have to provide principa s with the necessary facilities, resources, and staff for translating the provincial and school board's policies into means of achieving the desired goals. In addition, he will have to make available to principals certain central office services that would aid them in the implementation process, and he would have to make provisions for in-service programmes for teachers and principals.

Also, like the principal at the school, the school district administrator will have to represent many diverse groups and will have to involve more people in the planning and decision-making

process. This increased involvement will make him responsible for exercising his skills in coordinating the expectations, for the educational process, of many diverse segments of society.

In view of the fact that there were similar perceptions of proposals for change amongst principals of various school and personal and professional characteristics, the generalizations discussed above will probably apply to all schools and districts. However, grade level differences raise the possibility that future developments may reveal differences among types of schools. Similarly, the experience differences suggest that, insofar as implementation is influenced by principals, there will be variations even within types of schools.

In sum, the implementation of some of the proposals from the Worth Report that were included in the study, will necessitate the re-evaluation of the traditional structures at the school district, school and classroom levels of education. This will, in turn, require a redefinition of the roles of the principal, teacher, and school district administrator. The suggestion has been made that in each case the role will become more demanding than it was in the past and that a greater degree of planning, coordinating, and leadership will be required of these professionals. However, in order that each successfully fulfills the obligations of his role, there must be a team approach undertaken by these professionals so that their planning procedures for the implementation of the proposals are coordinated.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Further research may be carried out to determine the factors influencing the principals' perceptions when they considered some proposals to be more feasible to implement than others. Also, an attempt could be made to conduct a study on ways of modifying the principals' perceptions. Such evidence may provide some useful insight into the administrative process.

After a period of time, a study could be conducted to investigate how many of the proposals for change outlined in this study were implemented. Of particular interest would be to determine if the proposals that principals expressed the greatest degree of agreement with, attributed the most significance to, and perceived to be most feasible to implement, were more fully implemented than the remaining proposals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Block, James H. (ed.). Introduction to Mastery Learning: Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Boles, Harold W. Step by Step to Better School Facilities. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Campbell, Roald F., Edwin M. Bridges, John E. Corbally, Raphael O. Nystrand, and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Costello, Timothy W., and Sheldon S. Zalkind. Psychology in Administration: A Research Orientation. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Dixon, Wilfrid J., and Frank J. Massey. Introduction to Statistical Analysis. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

Edmonton Public Schools Extension Services. The Community School: A Focus on Living. Edmonton: Edmonton Public Schools Extension Services, 1971.

Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research Methodology and Design. New York: Meredith Corporation, 1972.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969.

Miklos, E. The Organization and Administration of Educational Systems: Internal Structures and Processes. Edmonton: Commission on Educational Planning, 1970b.

Neagley, Ross L., and N. D. Evans. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Operational Research Branch, Department of Education. List of Operating Schools in Alberta 1972-73. Edmonton: Operational Research Branch, Department of Education, 1972.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Riffel, J. A. Education Planning Re-Examined. Edmonton: Human Resources Research Council of Alberta, 1971.

Sergiovanni, Thomas, and Robert J. Starratt. Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

Wick, John W., and Donald L. Beggs. Evaluation for Decision-Making in the Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971.

Wilson, L. C., T. M. Byar, Arthur S. Shapiro, and Shirley H. Schell. Sociology of Supervision: An Approach to Comprehensive Planning in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Worth, Walter H. A Choice of Futures. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for the Province of Alberta, 1972.

PERIODICALS

Alexander, William M. "Community Involvement in Curriculum," Educational Leadership, 29:655-657, May, 1972.

Allen, Dwight W., and Gary L. Morrison. "Differentiated Staffing and the Non-Professional: A Need for Educational Personnel Development," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 5:51-56, Winter, 1972.

Anderson, G. E. "New Computer Programs Help Flexible Schedules," Nation's School's, 81:67, June, 1968.

Bazeli, Frank P. "Organization and Training of Paraprofessionals," Clearing House, 44:206-209, December, 1969.

Berg, David W. "An Option Plan: Learning Is Student-Centered," Clearing House, 45:107-111, October, 1970.

Betty, Charles. "A Community Primary School," Forum, 11:50-51, Spring, 1969.

Blumenberg, Eleanor. "The School-Community Advisory Council: For Better or for Worse?" Journal of Secondary Education, 46:60-62, February, 1971.

Britton, Jean O., and Joseph H. Britton. "Schools Serving the Total Family and Community," The Family Coordinator, 19:308-316, October, 1970.

Bumbarger, C. S., D. Friesen, E. A. Holdaway, and E. Miklos. "A Choice of Futures: Some Implications for Educational Administrators," The Canadian Administrator, 12:1-6, October, 1972.

Burbridge, Macdonald. "Community-Involvement or -Control," British Columbia School Trustee Education, 28:5-8, 1972.

Bush, Robert N., and Donald H. DeLay. "Making the School Schedule by Computer: Opening New Educational Alternatives," International Review of Education, 14:169-180, 1968.

Carpenter, Margaret B., and Sue A. Haggart. "Cost-Effectiveness Analysis for Educational Planning," Educational Technology, 10:26-30, October, 1970.

Chesler, Mark A. "Shared Power and Student Decision Making," Educational Leadership, 28:9-14, October, 1970.

Cooper, James M. "Differentiated Staffing: Some Questions and Answers," Education Digest, 37:5-7, May, 1972.

Coutts, H. T., and J. J. Bergen. "A Proposal for Alberta: A Modified School Year," Education Canada, 9:23-27, September, 1969.

Cronin, Joseph M. "The Principal's Role in Change," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 47:29-32, May, 1963.

Deshler, Betty, and John L. Erlich. "Citizen Involvement: Evolution in the Revolution," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:173-175, November, 1972.

Deterline, William A. "Applied Accountability," Educational Technology, 11:15-20, January, 1971.

Dull, Lloyd W. "The Cluster Concept in Career Education," Educational Leadership, 30:218-221, December, 1972.

Duncan, Merlin G. "An Assessment of Accountability: The State of the Art," Educational Technology, 11:27-30, January, 1971.

Ellsberg, Allan W. "A Relevant High School Curriculum," Journal of Secondary Education, 44:174-181, April, 1969.

English, Fenwick. "AFT/NEA Reaction to Staff Differentiation," Educational Forum, 36:193-198, January, 1972.

Enns, F. "Perception in the Study of Administration," The Canadian Administrator, 5:23-26, March, 1966.

Fantini, Mario. "Alternatives within Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:444-448, March, 1973.

_____. "Community Participation: Many Faces, Many Directions," Educational Leadership, 29:674-680, May, 1972.

Fredrickson, John H. "An Analysis of Conventional and Experimental Approaches to School Design and Construction," Educational Technology, 12:60-63, July, 1972.

Goldman, Harvey. "The Nature of Curricular Relevance," Educational Leadership, 27:489-497, February, 1970.

Hagans, Rex, and John Svicarovich. "An Employer Based Career Education Model," Educational Leadership, 30:222-224, December, 1972.

Hansen, L. S. "A Model for Career Development through Curriculum," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51:243-250, December, 1972.

Harmes, H. M. "Specifying Objectives for Performance Contracts," Educational Technology, 11:52-56, January, 1971.

Hartley, Harry J. "PPBS: Status and Implications," Educational Leadership, 29:658-661, May, 1972.

Heller, M. P. "The Administrator and Innovations," American School Board Journal, 155:19, March, 1968.

Hersom, Naomi. "Are School Administrators Curriculum Innovators?" The Canadian Administrator, 12:25-28, March, 1973.

Hickman, Charles W. "Volunteer Help: Resource in Instruction?" Educational Leadership, 30:121-124, November, 1972.

Holdaway, E. A., and J. E. Seger. "Change and the Principal," The Canadian Administrator, 6:13-16, January, 1967.

Holt, Howard B. "Year-Round Schools and System Shock," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:310-311, January, 1973.

Jackson, Shirley A. "The Curriculum Council: New Hope, New Promise," Educational Leadership, 29:690-694, May, 1972.

Jacobs, Jan W. "Leader Behavior of the Secondary-School Principal," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 49:13-17, October, 1965.

Johnson, W. F. "Performance Contracting with Existing Staff," Educational Technology, 11:59-60, January, 1971.

Jones, David M. "PPBS--A Tool for Improving Instruction," Educational Leadership, 28:405-409, January, 1971.

Kammann, Richard. "The Case for Making Each School in Your District 'Different'--and Letting Parents Choose the One That's Best for Their Child," The American School Board Journal, 159:37-38, January, 1972.

Kapfer, Philip G., and Miriam B. Kapfer. "Differentiated Staffing for Program Development: An In-Depth Look at an Incentive Model," Educational Technology, 12:9-13, June, 1972.

Lavender, John. "Occupational Versatility: Key to Careers," Educational Leadership, 30:215-217, December, 1972.

Law, Charles J. "Career Education Works!" Educational Leadership, 30:225-228, December, 1972.

Lessinger, Leon M. "The Powerful Notion of Accountability in Education," Journal of Secondary Education, 45:339-347, December, 1970.

_____ (ed.). "Robbing Dr. Peter to 'Pay Paul': Accounting for Our Stewardship of Public Education," Educational Technology, 11:11-14, January, 1971.

Levine, Donald M., C. B. Derr, and Richard P. Junghans. "Educational Planning with Organizational Development: A People-Involving Approach to Systemic Planning," Educational Technology, 12:14-26, October, 1972.

Manning, William R. "Cost Analysis and Curriculum Decisions," Educational Leadership, 28:179-183, May, 1969.

Marland, Sidney P. "The School's Role in Career Development," Educational Leadership, 30:203-205, December, 1972.

Mayrhofer, Albert V. "Factors to Consider in Preparing Performance Contracts for Instruction," Educational Technology, 11:48-51, January, 1971.

McIntosh, Gordon, and Robert Bryce. "New Futures in Education--A Conversation with Commissioner Worth," The CSA Bulletin, 11:14-43, Winter-Spring, 1972.

Mecklenburger, James A. "Performance Contracts? One View," Educational Leadership, 29:297-300, January, 1972.

Menkin, Paula. "It's the Attitude That Counts," Educational Leadership, 27:258-260, December, 1969.

Metcalf, Lawrence E., and Maurice P. Hunt. "Relevance and the Curriculum," Phi Delta Kappan, 51:358-361, March, 1970.

Miklos, E. "Increasing Participation in Decision Making," The Canadian Administrator, 9:25-29, March, 1970a.

Miller, George H. "School As a Community Centre," Ontario Education, 2:25-26, August, 1970.

Moore, Earl J., and Norman C. Gysbers. "Career Development: A New Focus," Educational Leadership, 30:257-260, December, 1972.

Morin, L. H. "Role Perception and Principals," The Canadian Administrator, 4:17-20, February, 1965.

Nickerson, Neal C. "Comments on Research," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 56:105-110, November, 1972.

Novotney, Fr. Jerrold M. "The Principal: The Key to Educational Change," Catholic School Journal, 68:68-73, February, 1968.

Ohme, Herman. "Steps toward Relevance: An Interest-Centered Curriculum," Journal of Secondary Education, 45:299-304, November, 1970.

Okey, James R. "The Tasks of Instruction," Educational Leadership, 28:381-384, January, 1971.

Patterson, Wade N. "Needed---Major Change in School Organization," School and Community, 56:30, February, 1970.

Pautler, Albert J. "Occupational Education in the Curriculum," Educational Leadership, 29:174-177, November, 1971.

Perrone, Vito. "Parents As Partners," The Urban Review, 5:35-40, November, 1971.

Richard, Francine. "Differentiated Staffing: What Are the Promises and the Pitfalls?" Illinois Education, 60:74-77, November, 1971.

Richards, Don K. "Curriculum Development at the Local Level," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52:38-47, April, 1968.

Rosenstein, Irving. "Diversion, Incursion, or Immersion? Using Community Resources," Educational Leadership, 30:128-130, November, 1972.

Russell, Dwane. "Goals for American Education: The Individual Focus," Educational Leadership, 28:592-594, March, 1971.

Schmuck, Richard, and Arthur Blumberg. "Teacher Participation in Organizational Decisions," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 53:89-105, October, 1969.

Sebolt, Alberta P. "The Community As a Learning Laboratory," Educational Leadership, 29:410-412, February, 1972.

Selden, David. "School Decentralization: A Positive Approach," The Record, 71:85-92, September, 1969.

Smith, Rodney P. "PPBS: Hazard or Promise?" Educational Leadership, 29:662-663, May, 1972.

Stewart, L. D. "Decision Making in Curriculum Development: Some Questions and Answers," The Canadian Administrator, 7:27-30, April, 1968.

Strohmenger, C. T., and Harold L. Henderson. "Career Development: Pandora's Box or Cornucopia?" Educational Leadership, 30:261-263, December, 1972.

Swaab, Alexander M. "Organizational Change and the Principal," Educational Technology, 12:55-57, October, 1972.

Telfer, Richard G. "Staff Involvement Key to Curriculum Improvement," Clearing House, 44:539-542, May, 1969.

Til, William V. "The Key Word Is Relevance," Today's Education, 58:14-18, January, 1969.

Torkelson, Gerald M. "Technology: New Goals for Individualization," Educational Leadership, 29:315-318, January, 1972.

Tsitrian, John. "The Furgeson Plan for All-Year School," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:314-315, January, 1973.

Tye, Kenneth A. "The Principal As a Change Agent," The National Elementary Principal, 49:41-51, February, 1970.

Weldy, Gilbert R. "Building Democratic Values through Student Participation," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 54:72-79, May, 1970.

White, William D. "Year-Round Education for K-12 Districts," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:312-313, January, 1973.

Wolansky, William D. "Teacher Aides--A First Step to Differentiated Staffing," School Shop, 32:30-31, December, 1972.

Worthington, Robert M. "A Home--Community Based Career Educational Model," Educational Leadership, 30:213-214, December, 1972.

Young, James H. "Pupil-Teacher Planning," Catholic School Journal, 69:38-42, November, 1969.

ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Airasian, Peter W. "The Role of Evaluation in Mastery Learning," in James H. Block (ed.). Introduction to Mastery Learning: Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Blaschke, Charles. "Performance Contracts," in David S. Bushnell and Donald Rappaport (eds.). Planned Change in Education: A Systems Approach. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.

Bloom, Benjamin S. "Mastery Learning," in James H. Block (ed.). Introduction to Mastery Learning: Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Our Accountability Problems," in Frank J. Sciara and Richard K. Jantz (eds.). Accountability in American Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Hastings, H. I. "A Systems Approach to Accountability," in J. J. Bergen (ed.). School Program and Accountability: The 1971 Alberta Principals' Leadership Course. Edmonton: Industrial Research and Training Centre, 1971.

Hemphill, H. D. "Educational Planning Dilemmas," in J. A. Riffel and E. Miklos (eds.). Social Goals, Educational Priorities, and Dollars: Planning Education in the Seventies. Edmonton: Human Resources Research Council of Alberta, 1970.

Hillson, Maurie. "Continuous Progress Education," in Maurie Hillson and Ronald T. Hyman (eds.). Change and Innovation in Elementary and Secondary Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Horowitz, Myer. "Elementary Education in the 1970's (Implications for the School Principal)," in J. J. Bergen and N. J. Chamchuk (eds.). The Principal's Role in the 70's: The 1970 Alberta Principals' Leadership Course. Edmonton: University of Alberta Printing Department, 1970.

Ingram, J. E. "Implementing Educational Change," in E. Miklos and H. E. Farquhar (eds.). The Principal and Educational Change: The 1966 Alberta Principals' Leadership Course. Edmonton: The Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1966.

Johnson, B. K. "Evaluation of Teaching: Some Practical Approaches," in J. J. Bergen (ed.). School Program and Accountability: The 1971 Alberta Principals' Leadership Course. Edmonton: Industrial Research and Training Centre, 1971.

Kruger, W. S. "Implications of Accountability for Educational Program Evaluation," in Frank J. Sciara and Richard K. Jantz (eds.). Accountability in American Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

MacKay, D. A. "Should Principals Be Change Agents?" in E. Miklos and H. E. Farquhar (eds.), The Principal and Educational Change: The 1966 Alberta Principals' Leadership Course. Edmonton: The Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1966.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Daloise, Donald D. "A Study of the Degree of Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to Organization and Administration Made by the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, 1959." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1970.

Maddocks, G. R. "A Study of the Degree of Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to the Supply, Preparation, and Payment of Teachers Made by the Alberta Royal Commission on Education, 1959." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1970.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

Instructions: Please circle the letter(s) and number which best represent your opinions with respect to the proposals set forth regarding school organization and operation. Be sure to answer all the questions as they pertain to your school. If you wish to comment on any of the proposals, you may do so by placing your comments directly beneath your encircled answer.

Directions and Legend:

1) In the first column, the proposal is stated.
2) In the second column you are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree with the proposal. SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree.
3) The third column asks you to indicate your opinion regarding the significance of the proposal for educational change. You will indicate your opinion on a scale going from highly significant (HS) to not significant (NS).
4) The fourth column asks you to indicate the feasibility of implementing the proposal. VE - Very Easy, E - Easy, U - Undecided, D - Difficult, VD - Very Difficult.

Example:

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
i. Parents should be required to attend home and school meetings.	i. SA A U D (SD) "Infringement on human rights."	i. HS 5 4 3 2 (1) NS	i. VE E U D (VD) "Cannot force parents to attend."

BEGIN HERE:

PART A: SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
1. Citizens should be involved to a greater extent in setting goals for schools.	1. SA A U D SD	1. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	1. VE E U D VD

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
2. Records of decision-making within the school system, such as budget allocations, should be made accessible to the public.	2. SA A U D SD	2. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	2. VE E U D VD
3. Each school should have a school council consisting of parents and other laymen, students, teachers, and administrators.	3. SA A U D SD	3. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	3. VE E U D VD
4. School councils should have the power to establish important policy decisions regarding the programme of studies.	4. SA A U D SD	4. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	4. VE E U D VD
5. School councils should determine budget priorities.	5. SA A U D SD	5. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	5. VE E U D VD
6. School councils should develop school regulations such as discipline and dress.	6. SA A U D SD	6. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	6. VE E U D VD
7. School councils should audit the extent to which school objectives are achieved.	7. SA A U D SD	7. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	7. VE E U D VD

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
8. School councils should be used as recruiting agents for adult volunteers from the community for purposes of non-instructional duties.	8. SA A U D SD	8. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	8. VE E U D VD
9. School councils should communicate community-school needs and concerns to school boards.	9. SA A U D SD	9. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	9. VE E U D VD
10. Schools should become centres of cultural, social, recreational, and educational activities in their respective communities.	10. SA A U D SD	10. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	10. VE E U D VD

PART B: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
11. Greater differentiation should be provided with respect to course offerings.	11. SA A U D SD	11. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	11. VE E U D VD
12. Greater differentiation should be provided with respect to teaching methods.	12. SA A U D SD	12. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	12. VE E U D VD
13. Teaching methods should be individual-centred.	13. SA A U D SD	13. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	13. VE E U D VD

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
14. Teachers and learners should mutually develop performance objectives.	14. SA A U D SD	14. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	14. VE E U D VD
15. Students should be evaluated on the basis of performance objectives.	15. SA A U D SD	15. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	15. VE E U D VD
16. Students should be allowed to accept only whatever guidance they think is appropriate for their purposes.	16. SA A U D SD	16. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	16. VE E U D VD
17. Greater emphasis should be given to Canadian studies.	17. SA A U D SD	17. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	17. VE E U D VD
18. Course content should focus on the interests and concerns of students.	18. SA A U D SD	18. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	18. VE E U D VD
19. Mastery learning, as perceived by Bloom and his disciples, should be stressed.	19. SA A U D SD	19. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	19. VE E U D VD
20. Power tests should be used as bench-marks from which to assess the level of achievement in schools.	20. SA A U D SD	20. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	20. VE E U D VD

PART C: USE OF COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL RESOURCES

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
21. Work experience relating to educational and career goals should be provided.	21. SA A U D SD	21. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	21. VE E U D VD
22. Volunteer aides and learning assistants should be more extensively utilized.	22. SA A U D SD	22. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	22. VE E U D VD
23. Differentiated staffing should include community resource people.	23. SA A U D SD	23. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	23. VE E U D VD
24. School administrators should make use of computerized scheduling for the purpose of improving the utilization of current space resources within schools and school systems.	24. SA A U D SD	24. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	24. VE E U D VD
25. Present attendance boundaries within administrative units should be abolished.	25. SA A U D SD	25. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	25. VE E U D VD

PART D: STAFF PERSONNEL

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
26. When no suitably qualified professional, trainee, or volunteer is available, school districts should have the authority to employ whomever they wish.	26. SA A U D SD	26. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	26. VE E U D VD
27. Schools should be staffed on the basis of a systematic study of learner needs.	27. SA A U D SD	27. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	27. VE E U D VD
28. Permanent certification of teachers should be abolished.	28. SA A U D SD	28. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	28. VE E U D VD
29. Teacher competence should be periodically reappraised by the community.	29. SA A U D SD	29. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	29. VE E U D VD
30. Teachers should be contracted and paid on the basis of end results.	30. SA A U D SD	30. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	30. VE E U D VD
31. Teacher role should shift from a director-imparter to a guide-consultant.	31. SA A U D SD	31. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	31. VE E U D VD

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
32. Counselling services available to teachers-in-training should be improved and increased to facilitate self-selection by prospective teachers.	32. SA A U D SD	32. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	32. VE E U D VD
33. Distinguished teachers should be encouraged to remain in teaching rather than accepting administrative positions.	33. SA A U D SD	33. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	33. VE E U D VD
34. Staff orientations should be consistent with the school's philosophy.	34. SA A U D SD	34. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	34. VE E U D VD
35. Special professional personnel, such as speech therapists and psychologists, should not be required to have teaching certificates.	35. SA A U D SD	35. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	35. VE E U D VD

PART E: SYSTEM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
36. Planning should be carried out in accordance with the principle of efficiency.	36. SA A U D SD	36. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	36. VE E U D VD

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
37. School budget time-frame should be lengthened from one year to three years for operating and five years for capital budgets.	37. SA A U D SD	37. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	37. VE E U D VD
38. Excessive manpower supply should be a valid reason for suspending and abandoning existing programmes.	38. SA A U D SD	38. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	38. VE E U D VD
39. Conventional units of school organization; that is, Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High, should be phased out.	39. SA A U D SD	39. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	39. VE E U D VD
40. Reorganization of the school year should be based on continuous learning year cycling plans whereby there are a number of short term learning periods interspersed by brief vacations.	40. SA A U D SD	40. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	40. VE E U D VD
41. Special attention should be given to costing in the design and evaluation of programmes.	41. SA A U D SD	41. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	41. VE E U D VD
42. Educational planning should be correlated with general social and economic planning.	42. SA A U D SD	42. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	42. VE E U D VD

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
43. Expenditures should be related more directly to the objectives that programmes purport to achieve.	43. SA A U D SD	43. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	43. VE E U D VD
44. Opportunity for intensive learning over a longer school day and a longer school year should be provided.	44. SA A U D SD	44. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	44. VE E U D VD
45. Organizational structures within the school should be less hierarchical in nature than they are at present.	45. SA A U D SD	45. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	45. VE E U D VD

PART F: PHYSICAL FACILITIES

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
46. Design of school buildings should be such that would facilitate rearrangement of the physical plant when necessary.	46. SA A U D SD	46. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	46. VE E U D VD
47. School design decisions should be made at the local level.	47. SA A U D SD	47. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	47. VE E U D VD
48. Certain schools should be designed as area schools offering services to neighbouring schools.	48. SA A U D SD	48. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	48. VE E U D VD

PROPOSAL	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT	SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSAL	EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION
49. Buildings for schooling should be designed so that their facilities are made more readily accessible for continuous use by all members of the community.	49. SA A U D SD	49. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	49. VE E U D VD
50. Greater use should be made of mobile and temporary buildings.	50. SA A U D SD	50. HS 5 4 3 2 1 NS	50. VE E U D VD

PERSONAL DATA

Please answer each item by placing a check mark (✓) in the space provided.

1. SEX:

   ( ) 1. Male
   ( ) 2. Female

2. AGE:

   ( ) 1. Under 25 years
   ( ) 2. 25 - 35 years
   ( ) 3. 36 - 50 years
   ( ) 4. 51 - 60 years
   ( ) 5. Over 60 years

3. GRADE ORGANIZATION OF YOUR SCHOOL:

   ( ) 1. Grades 1 - 12
   ( ) 2. Grades 1 - 9
   ( ) 3. Grades 1 - 6
   ( ) 4. Grades 1 - 10
   ( ) 5. Grades 7 - 12
   ( ) 6. Grades 7 - 9
   ( ) 7. Grades 9 - 12
   ( ) 8. Grades 10 - 12

4. POPULATION OF CENTRE IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED:

   ( ) 1. City - over 100,000
   ( ) 2. City - 20,000 - 100,000
   ( ) 3. City - 5,000 - 20,000
   ( ) 4. Town or City - 1,000 - 5,000
   ( ) 5. Other under 1,000

5. TYPE OF SCHOOL UNIT WHICH EMPLOYS YOU:

   ( ) 1. School Division or County
   ( ) 2. City Public School District
   ( ) 3. City R. C. Separate School District
   ( ) 4. Town Public School District
   ( ) 5. Town R. C. Separate School District
   ( ) 6. Village or Rural Public School District
   ( ) 7. Village or Rural Separate School District
   ( ) 8. Other (please specify) _____

6. PREPARATION: (Years of teacher education on which your salary is based.)

   ( ) 1. 1 year or less
   ( ) 2. 1.1 - 1.9 years
   ( ) 3. 2.0 - 2.9 years
   ( ) 4. 3.0 - 3.9 years
   ( ) 5. 4.0 - 4.9 years
   ( ) 6. 5.0 - 5.9 years
   ( ) 7. 6.0 - 6.9 years
   ( ) 8. 7 or more years

7. TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

( ) 1. 1 year
( ) 2. 2 years
( ) 3. 3 years
( ) 4. 4 - 5 years
( ) 5. 6 - 10 years
( ) 6. 11 - 15 years
( ) 7. 16 - 20 years
( ) 8. More than 20 years

8. GRADUATE TRAINING IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION:

( ) 1. No graduate courses
( ) 2. Some graduate courses
( ) 3. Diploma in Educational Administration
( ) 4. M. Ed in Educational Administration

9. NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION OF PRINCIPAL:

( ) 1. 2 or less years
( ) 2. 3 - 5 years
( ) 3. 6 - 10 years
( ) 4. 11 - 15 years
( ) 5. 16 - 20 years
( ) 6. 20 or more years

10. TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS AS PRINCIPAL:

( ) 1. 2 or less years
( ) 2. 3 - 5 years
( ) 3. 6 - 10 years
( ) 4. 11 - 15 years
( ) 5. 16 - 20 years
( ) 6. 20 or more years

11. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS VICE-PRINCIPAL PRIOR TO BECOMING PRINCIPAL:

( ) 1. None
( ) 2. 1 year
( ) 3. 2 years
( ) 4. 3 years
( ) 5. 4 years
( ) 6. 5 or more years

12. NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK ALLOWED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES:

( ) 1. One-half day or less
( ) 2. One day
( ) 3. Two days
( ) 4. Three days
( ) 5. Four days
( ) 6. Five days

13. NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL:

( ) 1. 1
( ) 2. 2 - 4
( ) 3. 5 - 9
( ) 4. 10 - 14
( ) 5. 15 - 19
( ) 6. 20 - 24
( ) 7. 25 - 29
( ) 8. 30 - 39
( ) 9. 40 - 44
( ) 10. 45 or more

APPENDIX B

COVERING AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

January, 1973

Dear Colleague:

I am currently on leave from my teaching position in Edmonton and am in full-time residence at the University of Alberta completing the requirements of the M. Ed. degree in educational administration. My thesis research topic involves an examination of the opinions of Alberta school principals with respect to the implementation of some proposals on school organization and operation as outlined in some of the recent literature. Specifically, I am attempting to examine the extent to which principals in the province agree with the proposals for change; the extent of agreement regarding the significance of the various proposals to educational change; and, the feasibility of implementing the proposals for bringing about change.

I would be grateful for your cooperation in the study by completing the enclosed questionnaire. This questionnaire is designed to take a minimum amount of your time, whereby you only have to circle the letters and numbers, or place a check mark in the appropriate bracket.

May I assure you that all the information you provide will be kept anonymous. When you complete the questionnaire, place it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope and send it to me. Could I please have the questionnaire back in three weeks time?

When I complete the study, I will send you a summary of the findings.

Yours truly,

William Lysak

February, 1973

Dear Colleague:

About two weeks ago a questionnaire, entitled "School Organization and Operation," was mailed to you along with a self-addressed envelope. In this short period of time, the response has been rather encouraging. Approximately fifty per cent of the sample of Alberta school principals have already replied.

However, it would be desirable if I had a larger number of responses so that I can begin my analysis soon. May I remind you at this time that the three-week deadline, suggested in my previous letter, will soon be here. If you have not sent the completed questionnaire back to me, then please do so. However, if you have already done so, then disregard this letter.

Also, may I once again assure you that your responses will be kept anonymous.

I sincerely thank you for your cooperation and assistance in helping me to complete this study.

Yours truly,

William Lysak

APPENDIX C

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION TABLES

Table 30

Percentage Distribution, in the Category of Agreement, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal Number*	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
1.	11.4	63.6	6.9	13.6	4.5
2.	23.8	55.1	8.4	8.1	4.5
3.	16.0	44.9	16.3	14.8	8.1
4.	5.7	24.7	15.4	34.3	19.9
5.	4.5	23.2	13.3	35.5	23.5
6.	7.5	37.3	16.6	21.1	17.5
7.	3.6	36.1	20.2	22.0	18.1
8.	15.7	36.4	16.6	17.5	13.9
9.	26.5	53.3	6.6	7.5	6.0
10.	44.3	38.6	10.5	5.4	1.2
11.	14.5	50.6	17.2	16.3	1.5
12.	20.5	56.3	16.0	5.1	2.1
13.	33.1	52.1	8.7	4.5	1.5
14.	13.0	63.6	12.7	8.1	2.7
15.	16.9	61.7	12.0	7.5	1.8
16.	1.5	10.2	15.7	47.0	25.6
17.	40.1	44.6	8.4	5.1	1.8
18.	13.9	56.6	12.0	15.7	1.8

Table 30 (continued)

Proposal Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
19.	5.4	41.6	37.0	14.5	1.5
20.	5.4	36.4	28.3	22.9	6.9
21.	34.6	54.8	6.3	2.4	1.8
22.	23.2	45.2	15.4	10.2	6.0
23.	16.6	54.8	16.9	7.5	4.2
24.	12.7	43.1	29.8	11.4	3.0
25.	13.0	34.0	25.9	17.8	9.3
26.	3.9	14.5	14.5	23.2	44.0
27.	24.4	57.2	13.6	3.9	0.9
28.	4.5	14.8	12.0	31.9	36.7
29.	3.0	12.7	10.5	31.3	42.5
30.	1.5	5.4	6.3	31.0	55.7
31.	19.6	47.0	16.9	13.0	3.6
32.	27.7	51.2	19.0	2.1	0.0
33.	31.0	44.3	11.4	8.7	4.5
34.	28.9	63.3	5.7	1.8	0.3
35.	8.4	36.4	17.5	23.5	14.2
36.	16.9	53.6	13.0	12.0	4.5

Table 30 (continued)

Proposal Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
37.	5.4	37.7	35.2	18.7	3.0
38.	1.2	8.1	33.7	38.9	18.1
39.	5.1	22.3	24.7	38.3	9.6
40.	9.3	32.2	24.4	20.5	13.6
41.	8.7	65.4	12.7	10.8	2.4
42.	14.8	67.5	12.0	5.1	0.6
43.	12.3	60.2	18.7	6.9	1.8
44.	2.1	21.1	17.8	39.2	19.9
45.	6.9	32.8	27.7	25.3	7.2
46.	32.5	56.0	7.5	1.8	2.1
47.	21.7	51.5	13.3	11.1	2.4
48.	16.0	65.4	12.3	5.7	0.6
49.	42.2	47.6	5.7	3.6	0.9
50.	10.8	38.0	26.8	17.8	6.6

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

Table 31

Percentage Distribution, in the Category of Significance, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal Number*	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
1.	12.7	40.7	33.7	8.4	4.5
2.	14.2	34.0	30.4	13.0	8.4
3.	15.1	37.7	27.7	13.0	6.6
4.	15.7	25.0	28.3	16.9	14.2
5.	14.2	25.6	22.3	20.5	17.5
6.	10.8	28.0	25.0	18.1	18.1
7.	12.7	30.1	27.7	13.6	16.0
8.	13.9	28.6	28.0	16.3	13.3
9.	25.6	43.4	20.2	6.0	4.8
10.	39.8	36.1	17.8	4.5	1.8
11.	16.9	45.2	24.4	9.9	3.6
12.	19.9	48.8	22.3	5.4	3.6
13.	38.6	39.5	16.0	4.5	1.5
14.	16.9	45.2	27.1	8.1	2.7
15.	18.4	51.8	21.7	5.7	2.4
16.	13.9	22.9	28.9	19.9	14.5
17.	39.8	33.7	17.8	5.1	3.6
18.	16.0	46.7	28.6	6.9	1.8

Table 31 (continued)

Proposal Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
19.	6.3	33.1	40.1	13.9	6.6
20.	7.8	27.4	38.0	17.2	9.6
21.	29.2	42.8	21.1	3.6	3.3
22.	24.4	34.6	25.6	9.6	5.7
23.	17.8	40.7	29.8	8.7	3.0
24.	10.2	24.7	41.3	12.7	11.1
25.	17.8	24.4	31.9	16.0	9.9
26.	31.0	23.5	19.6	8.7	17.2
27.	26.2	41.0	25.0	6.0	1.8
28.	30.7	22.0	18.1	13.3	16.0
29.	25.3	19.6	13.0	19.3	22.9
30.	26.5	18.1	13.3	13.9	28.3
31.	21.1	40.7	25.6	9.0	3.6
32.	25.6	35.5	30.4	6.6	1.8
33.	33.1	41.3	17.8	5.4	2.4
34.	23.5	53.6	19.9	2.1	0.9
35.	14.8	35.2	29.2	14.8	6.0
36.	19.3	41.9	27.4	9.0	2.4

Table 31 (continued)

Proposal Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
37.	9.6	31.9	43.4	10.2	4.8
38.	6.3	21.7	36.4	22.0	13.6
39.	9.9	30.4	30.4	18.1	11.1
40.	17.5	33.7	28.3	13.3	7.2
41.	12.7	46.1	31.9	7.5	1.8
42.	16.3	48.2	28.3	6.0	1.2
43.	13.3	41.0	34.6	8.7	2.4
44.	7.8	25.3	25.9	27.1	13.9
45.	7.5	26.2	39.5	18.1	8.7
46.	30.4	43.1	19.0	4.8	2.7
47.	21.1	44.6	23.2	8.7	2.4
48.	16.9	46.7	26.2	8.1	2.1
49.	37.7	40.1	17.2	3.0	2.1
50.	11.4	26.2	39.8	13.6	9.0

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.

Table 32

Percentage Distribution, in the Category of Ease of Implementation, Based on the Responses from the Total Sample of Principals

Proposal Number*	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
1.	0.6	13.0	11.1	56.0	19.3
2.	17.8	52.7	9.3	14.2	6.0
3.	6.3	29.5	19.3	32.5	12.3
4.	2.1	14.2	21.4	34.6	27.7
5.	3.6	18.7	19.3	30.4	28.0
6.	3.6	34.3	16.6	27.4	18.1
7.	0.6	11.4	22.9	29.8	35.2
8.	5.7	35.2	25.9	23.2	9.9
9.	8.7	51.2	17.5	15.4	7.2
10.	8.7	32.5	15.1	34.3	9.3
11.	3.6	22.6	22.3	38.9	12.7
12.	2.7	27.1	22.3	37.7	10.2
13.	2.4	18.7	13.3	42.5	23.2
14.	1.8	29.8	20.2	36.7	11.4
15.	3.0	37.3	23.2	26.2	10.2
16.	6.6	15.4	29.8	31.9	16.3
17.	16.6	44.0	17.2	19.9	2.4
18.	4.2	34.9	18.1	34.3	8.4

Table 32 (continued)

Proposal Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
19.	2.7	19.9	44.3	25.6	7.5
20.	9.6	42.2	31.0	11.7	5.4
21.	4.2	28.6	13.9	43.4	9.9
22.	7.5	30.4	18.7	34.0	9.3
23.	4.5	31.3	26.2	31.3	6.6
24.	3.6	18.1	36.1	27.4	14.8
25.	13.3	26.2	27.1	19.6	13.9
26.	13.6	20.2	22.6	18.7	25.0
27.	2.4	19.9	26.5	36.1	15.1
28.	15.7	19.3	18.7	22.0	24.4
29.	1.5	7.8	12.3	20.5	57.8
30.	1.2	5.1	7.8	13.0	72.9
31.	2.1	23.5	24.7	40.7	9.0
32.	3.9	32.2	35.2	23.5	5.1
33.	6.9	26.8	22.9	31.6	11.7
34.	5.7	51.2	16.9	23.5	2.7
35.	9.3	37.3	31.6	14.5	7.2
36.	3.9	33.7	27.7	28.0	6.6

Table 32 (continued)

Proposal Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%
37.	2.1	19.3	38.6	28.6	11.4
38.	3.0	15.7	50.6	22.3	8.4
39.	3.6	18.4	26.2	36.7	15.1
40.	3.6	12.3	23.5	33.1	27.4
41.	3.3	32.5	25.0	31.6	7.5
42.	1.5	21.4	32.8	35.8	8.4
43.	1.8	22.6	31.6	34.9	9.0
44.	0.9	13.3	25.3	35.5	25.0
45.	2.1	22.9	33.7	33.1	8.1
46.	3.9	20.2	16.6	39.8	19.6
47.	6.9	33.7	19.3	29.2	10.8
48.	5.4	38.3	21.4	29.8	5.1
49.	7.8	46.4	14.2	25.6	6.0
50.	5.7	38.0	34.0	17.8	4.5

*For the content of the numbered proposals, refer to the questionnaire in Appendix A.